Interview with Marshall Green

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training Foreign Affairs Oral History Project

AMBASSADOR MARSHALL GREEN

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy

Initial interview date: March 2, 1995

Q: Today is March 2, 1995. This is an interview with Ambassador Marshall Green. This segment of the interview will be devoted mainly to the Japanese connection. We'll also fill in concerning Australia and some of Ambassador Green's earlier assignments. Mr. Ambassador, could you tell me a bit about your family, your date of birth, and when and where you grew up. I am Charles Stuart Kennedy.

GREEN: I was born on January 27, 1916, which means that I've just turned 79. I was born in Holyoke, Massachusetts. My father was a wool manufacturer and also a lawyer. He was sort of a champion of the New England textile industry in Washington, DC. He “lobbied” for them, quite apart from his being the chairman of the Farr Alpaca Company, which at the time was the second largest wool manufacturing concern in New England. It handled not only wool but also mohair, cotton, and other fabrics. We had a beautiful home, called Meadow View of which not a trace remains today, the house having been burned down and its 300 acres bulldozed to make way for Route 90 interstate and the rest for estate development.

My parents loved to travel. We went abroad to Europe, just about every summer after I was seven years old. My whole orientation was toward Europe. I knew nothing about the

Far East. My father's connections with the Far East were simply as spokesman for the woolen industry. He fought against imports of textiles from Japan, always trying to raise the tariffs on them. How well I remember his declamatory performance before the House Ways and Means Committee and the National Industrial Conference Board of which he was once chairman.

My father and mother were great travelers, spending most of their summers in Western Europe where father pursued his interests in pre-history as chairman of the American School of Pre-History, and mother pursuing her interests in art and architecture. My two sisters and I accompanied them on all these trips, though we were left in a small summer school in Houlgeth, France, for four of those months while they traveled about Europe.

Both of our parents were great readers, with father concentrating on Sir Walter Scott and on British voyages (which he read aloud to us on many an evening) and mother immersed in Jane Austin and meeting the people.

As far as schooling was concerned, my sisters and I attended a small private school of which mother was principal benefactor, before I went on to two years at Indian Mountain School and then six years at Groton school. My four subsequent years at Yale, were, I fear, largely taken up with sports and an active social life, with too little time devoted to the serious pursuit of my areas of concentration in French literature and American government.

This is all by way of background. It meant that, when I finally went to Japan, I had no familiarity with East Asia. There was nothing in my whole background that entitled me to be Ambassador Joseph C. Grew's secretary. So that's my background.

Q: You made these trips to Europe, and your father was involved in trade matters. Did you have any interest at Groton and Yale about the Foreign Service and working for the State Department?

GREEN: I moved in circles that knew little about the Foreign Service, except that my school, Groton, had many illustrious graduates, including [President] Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Sumner Wells [Under Secretary of State during World War II], Governor Averell Harriman, and people like that. So there was a tradition at Groton of men going into public service. In fact, its well-known Rector, Endicott Peabody, continually used the pulpit to exhort young men to get out there in the world and to serve society. The motto of our school was, “Qui Servir est Regnare,” which means, “To serve Him is to reign.” That did have its impact upon me. There's no question that the Rector at Groton had a great impact upon me.

One of his graduates was Joseph C. Grew, who was Ambassador to Japan before World War II [1932-1942]. He later served as Under Secretary and Acting Secretary of State, and it was he who eventually asked me to be his private secretary.

Q: What was the timing? When had you graduated from Yale?

GREEN: I graduated from Yale in 1939. I was already enrolled in the Law School, when I overheard two people in French class, I think it was, talking about Grew looking for a private secretary. So I went down to Washington, DC, to apply for the job. Quite frankly, one of the requirements to be his private secretary was to have gone to his old home school, Groton. In fact, he used to ask Endicott Peabody to suggest someone who would take that job on. He had four such private secretaries over the course of time.

So I went down to Washington and was interviewed by Ambassador Grew. We had lunch at the Metropolitan Club and then went back to his house on Woodland Drive. I was talking to him when suddenly a voice came through the wall, saying, “Whom are you speaking to, Joe dear?” He said, “I'm speaking to Marshall Green.” She said, “Who is he, for heaven's sake?” He said, “He's interested in being my private secretary.” “Oh,” said this voice, trailing off. Then I resumed the conversation with the Ambassador. Again through the wall came this voice, “Ask him, Joe, if he plays bridge.” The Ambassador asked, “Do you play

bridge, Mr. Green?" I said, "I'm crazy about bridge, Mr. Ambassador." He said, "He's crazy about bridge, Alice." Her voice came back, "Well, take him, Joe, take him, and let's get it over with." So I became one of two leading candidates through that conversation, and eventually the other candidate was eliminated when it became known to the Rector the other candidate had rather rigged the election against me to be captain of Groton's football team in 1934.

Anyway, I was freshly out of Yale, having graduated in June. By October I was on my way to Japan. The process moved that fast.

Q: Was this October, 1939?

GREEN: Yes.

Q: World War II had just started.

GREEN: Yes. World War II had just started. I was driving west on my way to Japan, spending a good deal of time visiting friends. I went all over the place. I remember that it was in Eureka, California, that I overheard the report of the outbreak of war in Europe.

So I joined Ambassador Grew in San Francisco and went out on the "Tatsuta Maru", a Japanese liner. I put my Ford convertible in the hold of the ship. It was transported to Japan for $50. I had it during the whole time I was in Japan. Finally, I sold it to the younger brother of the Emperor before I left. Then it was painted maroon, because all of the Imperial family cars had to be maroon in color. That is just a sidelight.

So I went out to Japan. It was during our transpacific trip that I got to know Mrs. Grew, who was to be a great bridge companion. Then en route to Japan, I played golf with the Ambassador in Hawaii. I shot about the best score that I ever had. That endeared me to him, and I became his constant golf companion in Japan.

Q: Obviously, you were brand new and really still "wet behind the ears" when you arrived in Japan. How did you view Japan at that time? How did it appear in your eyes in 1939?

GREEN: Yes. I had very little in the way of background, except that I was highly knowledgeable about geography. I was also interested in demography, being convinced that the expansionism of Germany, Italy, and Japan was rooted in population pressures of those crowded countries. So I went to Japan, knowing all about the geography and demography of the area, but almost nothing of its politics and little of history and culture.

I arrived in mid-October 1939 as a freshly minted, potential Foreign Service Officer, but I wasn't in the Foreign Service. I was being paid out of Ambassador Grew's own pocket the princely sum of $50 a month, for which I wrote out the checks, and he signed them. But on $50 a month I could live pretty well because my Embassy compound apartment was free and many of us converted US dollars on the black market in China into yen at four times the rate you could get in Japan. We could do that through colleagues and friends in China. That was illegal, but everybody did it, except the Ambassador.

On the other hand, since we saw Japan as a potential enemy, it wasn't terribly hard to square my New England conscience with this kind of activity.

Q: How did you view the Japanese system?

GREEN: I never claimed to know much about how the Japanese system operated and I had to depend on the Embassy viewpoint of others whom I encountered. Of course, I was more impressed by the views of Ambassador Grew who showed me his daily diary entries. I was also influenced by the views of senior Embassy officers like Gene Dooman and Ned Crocker or more junior ones like Max Schmidt and Jim Espy. I also had many good friends in the diplomatic and consular corps both in Tokyo and Yokohama. But, as you can see, I had almost no Japanese friends except those with whom I played football and golf or whom I met at Embassy social functions.

Q: “Turbulent Era,” for example.

GREEN: That's right.

Q: I read that book, and that decided me to go into the Foreign Service.

GREEN: Oh, yes. Well, anyway, I can tell you this. I wasn't very helpful to Grew, except socially. I didn't know anything about Japan. I wasn't a very serious student of Japan. I never wrote any reports for him about Japan or took on a particular subject, as, indeed, one of my predecessors, Jeff Parsons—J. Graham Parsons—had done. He'd been with Grew for three or four years and had become very helpful to Grew. My successor, Bob Fearey, also became most useful to Grew, being deeply involved in events that occurred just before Pearl Harbor. And then, during their incarceration, he helped to put together Grew's report to Secretary Hull.

Q: You were there...

GREEN: I was there for almost two years—not quite. A year and three-quarters.

Q: You left when?

GREEN: I left Japan in May, 1941. My feelings about Japan at that time, as I say, were very much shaped by Grew and by the people around him. Eugene Dooman was the Counselor of the Embassy, was born in Japan, and spoke Japanese absolutely fluently. Grew didn't speak a word of Japanese, nor did Mrs. Grew. I was shocked at that. He and Mrs. Grew had been in Japan for many years. She had been there as a young girl and later on as the wife of Ambassador Grew. The Ambassador had already been in Japan for about seven years when I arrived there. I remember that on Thanksgiving Day, 1939, when we were down in Kobe to take the train back to Kyoto, where we were staying, they didn't even know how to say, “Where is the train to Osaka or Kyoto.” They couldn't speak a word of Japanese.

I don't really believe that Ambassador Grew had very much, first-hand information about the inner workings of the Japanese system. He relied for his information on the Japanese Foreign Ministry, on the Imperial Household, on the ministerial group, on his Foreign Service colleagues, and on his diplomatic colleagues. At the same time, he had an infinite capacity for detail. He worked very hard and conscientiously. He applied himself to the task. He “lived” the problems.

One could criticize Grew, as many did, for being too pro-Japanese, for being too oriented toward Japanese goals, rather than, say, Chinese, American, or other goals. That's unfair. The fact of the matter is that he was a great American statesman. He thought in broad-minded terms. One must admit, nevertheless, that he was always hopeful, always playing for the chance that Japan might straighten itself out, that maybe by one more diplomatic effort we could avoid what seemed to be an almost inevitable Armageddon. He tried every route to see if there wasn't some way to avoid war.

What he was warning Washington about all the time was this: we're talking awfully “tough” back in Washington, but we don't have the stick to back that up. We ought to be damned careful about being as “tough” as we were regarding economic sanctions or holding back on shipments of scrap, ships, planes, or even oil, which was the most critical of all. If we (including the UK, Holland, France, etc.), were going to embargo shipments to Japan of these things (especially oil), Japan is going to be driven to the wall, and we were going to find ourselves at war with Japan, inevitably. But he was always wondering whether there wasn't some way out of that.

Of course, meanwhile, we were already well into World War II. During the first half or three-quarters of my first year there, it was a “phony” war. Then the situation became very serious when Japan joined the Tripartite Axis.

Meanwhile, Ambassador Grew was “distant” from the fighting which was going on in China. He was “distant” from the Manchukuo puppet empire there [in Manchuria]. I think

that a lot of people in Washington—and, certainly, people in our Embassy in China—felt that Grew really didn't understand what a horrible machine the Japanese Army was and the cruelties that they visited upon the Chinese. Well, now, Grew did know that. So these comments aren't fair. On the other hand, if you don't experience these things at first hand and don't see or hear or live through them, you're always going to be seen as not knowing the real, inside truth.

Q: Did he make any effort to get out and around, or could he have done so?

GREEN: Well, I don't think that he did enough of that. I also think that he should have gone back to Washington once or twice to pursue his case, because he had a very good case. However, you have to remember that traveling to Washington, in those days, took at least a month or two. Even if you took Pan American Airways, which was just starting its transpacific route, you still had to go by ship all the way down to Manila or Hong Kong to take the flying boat. So it was very difficult to communicate in person with Washington. On the other hand, you could pick up a phone, but the phone was insecure. There was another problem, and that was the problem of coded communications. Grew did not know about “Magic,” in other words, that we had broken the Japanese [diplomatic] code, although I don't think that we had broken it much before Pearl Harbor.

Q: It was pretty close to the time of Pearl Harbor.

GREEN: There's one thing that one must always remember. That is, if you do have access to “Magic,” as they called it, you may feel that you are in the know with superior knowledge in relationship to those without access to broken coded messages. Therefore, there is a tendency that outsiders' views are not given the weight that they would otherwise be given by insiders.

Back in Washington Secretary of State Hull was privy to “Magic,” as well as President Roosevelt, presumably. I don't know whether Dr. Stanley Hornbeck was privy to “Magic.”

He was the head of the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. Whatever it was, this was an “angle” which, I think, was worth taking into consideration.

Q: Did Grew have access, as Ambassadors often do, to “movers and shakers” in Japan who came in to meet with him and discuss various issues over cigars, and so forth?

GREEN: Yes, there were, of course, lots of people who would come in and who had various kinds of experience. Especially journalists. The newsmen tended to get around. Obviously, in Japan they were subject to censorship. The extent to which they knew things and were able to communicate them back to their home offices was not too good. It isn't as if there were well informed newsmen of the type you have today. There were some. But mostly there was lots of information dealing with little issues or scandals involving individuals. But when it came to knowing the real “inside” of what the Emperor, the Japanese military and particularly the Army, or the people who “really mattered” were thinking, there was very little way of knowing.

Q: How about our military attach#s? Did they have any particular entree?

GREEN: The attach#s did have some entree to the military, to the Japanese Navy, but very little to the Japanese Army. After all, the Navy had had more foreign connections than the Japanese Army. The Japanese Army, though, was politically more powerful than the Japanese Navy, and really ran the whole “show.”

Q: At this point Japan was more or less under a military dictatorship, or a military oligarchy, or what have you.

GREEN: Yes. The Army was “calling the tune,” getting ever more deeply involved in Manchuria and then in China. It made heavy demands, both in terms of finances and personnel. What is hard to say is the extent to which the Emperor would prevail if he were to take a strong stand against what the Army wanted. Or would the Army simply find some

way of “hushing him up.” One never knew. I think that Grew was making his “pitch” very much to the Imperial Household and the Emperor.

Q: How did this take place?

GREEN: Well, really, it took place through intermediaries: people like Marquis Kido, Count Kalbayana, and Baron Maeda. They all had connections with the Imperial Family. He invited the brothers of the Emperor to the Embassy for dinner parties and things like that. Obviously, the Emperor knew a lot about Ambassador Grew. We went through the formal “bows” at the Imperial Palace once a year—or twice a year, in his case. But, by and large, the Emperor was “out there somewhere.” Ambassador Grew had these intermediaries through their insights into how the Emperor felt. On the whole, he felt that the Emperor could exercise a beneficial and stabilizing influence in a country that otherwise seemed to be plunging rather relentlessly toward war, thanks to the powerful position of the military, especially the top generals.

Q: What was the feeling in the Embassy at the time about the Japanese invasion of China? Where was it going, what did it mean, and how would it play out?

GREEN: Well, the Embassy was involved in all kinds of protests that came out of the situation in China, like the sinking of the USS PANAY [a gunboat on Yangtze patrol which was sunk by Japanese bombers].

Q: When did that happen?

GREEN: That was in 1937, I think. These were incidents which occurred in which Japanese force resulted in the killing or injury of Americans or damage to their property or interests. Those were things that had to be taken up in Tokyo by Ambassador Grew.

I am not aware that Ambassador Grew had much first-hand knowledge of what was going on in China. Even if he did, I'm not sure that it would have changed his thinking. The

fact that he was continually trying to “get through” and ingratiate and commend, which is the typical way a diplomat functions, was seen by some as being “soft” toward Japan. However, I think that when you read his diary, you realize that there is no “softness” there. He was just trying to use all of the diplomatic arts to keep peace.

During those last six months before the Pearl Harbor attack (I had left Japan in May), Grew was involved in a major effort through Prince Konoye to try to set up a meeting between Konoye and President Roosevelt in Alaska, in which the two leaders would get together and come to some agreements which would at least have staved off war. I think that Grew felt that President Roosevelt would welcome such a development, because Roosevelt was so anxious to keep supplies going to Europe and keep our Navy [in the Atlantic] to protect British merchant ships carrying supplies to beleaguered Britain. If the United States became involved in a war in the Pacific, it would have been quite a blow to our total capacity to help Britain in its beleaguered hours. So I think that Grew felt that Roosevelt would be sympathetic to some efforts [in this direction], and there was some evidence that Roosevelt was.

This brings up the whole question of Dr. Stanley Hornbeck and his extraordinary powers. I don't recall if I ever met him or not. However, we are talking about a man who was a presence we felt very strongly [in the Embassy] in Tokyo. He was the equivalent of the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. His official title was Director of Far Eastern Affairs in the State Department.

He was born in China of missionary parents, or perhaps his father was a businessman. Anyway, he was brought up in China. He was pro-Chinese in his viewpoint and very anti-Japanese. Ambassador Grew used to send copies of daily entries in his diaries to Hornbeck in the hope that Hornbeck would be able to see the issues in a more balanced way and realize what Grew was trying to do. But I think that Grew was dealing with a man [Hornbeck] whose views were rigidly set and who was very bitterly anti-Japanese, as anybody whose experience was in China would make him. The difficulty was that

Ambassador Grew's communications with Washington were by cable. There were almost no telephone calls. It was all done by telegram. The telegrams went to Hornbeck before they went to Secretary Hull. Or, if they went to the White House, Hull would be asked to comment and would ask Hornbeck [for his views]. So Hornbeck's input became rather governing, with regard to Washington's reactions to [what Grew reported or recommended].

This became a very major issue just before Pearl Harbor. I had left Japan, and my successor, Bob Fearey, was deeply involved. He's written articles about this whole episode that deserve careful reading.

Q: What were your duties when you were private secretary to Ambassador Grew in the Embassy in Tokyo?

GREEN: My duties were largely of a social nature. I made the seating arrangements for luncheons and dinners. “Chief of Protocol” would be a better description of what I did. I had to take the inventory of the wine cellar of the Embassy. I had to handle the checkbooks and keep the Ambassador's local accounts. Not his investments, of course, since we are talking about his expenditures from day to day. I often played bridge with Mrs. Grew and golf with the Ambassador.

I had played football during my years at Yale—on the 150 pound team. I found myself playing football in Japan and was eventually elected to the “All-East Japan Football Team.” I remember playing football on New Year's Day in both 1939 and 1940. In 1940 I had to change my clothes immediately from morning suit (after attending a palace reception) to football clothes in the Ambassador's stand-by limousine, with shades drawn, while I sped from the Imperial Palace to Korakuen Stadium, where we won handily against the All-West Japan Team from the Kansai, the Osaka-Kobe area.

Q: Did you have any particular feeling about the Embassy? Let's start with, say, Eugene Dooman. What was his relationship...

GREEN: Well, I think that Dooman had a profound influence on Ambassador Grew—probably disproportionately so, because of his knowledge of Japanese and his background in Japan. He shaped Grew's thinking to a large extent. There were others around Grew, like Ned Crocker, a First Secretary who was later to become my father-in-law; Stuart Grummon, the other First Secretary; and “Chip” Bohlen, Second Secretary, who had a lot of expertise regarding the Soviet Union and had come to Tokyo direct from Moscow. These were all able people who had a marked influence on Grew's thinking. However, I would quickly add that the Japanese whom I earlier mentioned had a lot of influence on him, as did some of the American newsmen, either stationed in the Tokyo area—the ones who spoke English and ran the “Japan Times,” the Fleischers—people like that had influence on the Ambassador's thinking.

Then, of course, there were lots of distinguished visitors who came through Tokyo. The Ambassador would meet with them. So he had a wide exposure to other people's thinking on world problems, quite apart from the fact that he had a long background in diplomacy.

Q: How would you characterize the Embassy, either professionally or otherwise? This was the first glimpse you had of an Embassy family. How did Grew and Dooman run the place?

GREEN: By today's terms it was not a big Embassy, which meant that personal relationships were closer than is usual today, with Grew and Dooman heading up the Embassy family.

Q: You played football with Japanese. What was their attitude toward China and Korea?

GREEN: I had a feeling that the Westernized Japanese, mostly “Nisei” (second generation Japanese-American) who came back to Japan, stayed out of politics. They talked very little. For the most part people were pretty damned super-cautious about expressing their

opinions and views, because there was the “Kempeitai,” and other police and thought control organizations. People had to be careful. It wasn't as bad as we've seen in some of the dictatorships in modern times, but it was approaching that.

Q: Did you feel that when you traveled around Japan?

GREEN: Yes, I felt it. I can't say that I traveled very much around Japan. I wish that I had traveled more. I did take one long trip which took me through Korea, Manchukuo, and North and Eastern China. I was carrying messages and materials for our Embassy in Peking, as well as to our Consulates in Shanghai and Mukden, which is now Shenyang. I must say that, having taken that trip, I had a rather different view of Japan. You saw Japan from a different standpoint, and it was a critical one. Of course, things were almost chaotic in China, but clearly, the Japanese were invaders and ruthless occupiers of neighboring countries, that's all. There was no other way of looking at it. I might say that, after taking that trip, I was more anti-Japanese than I had been. Frankly, I was rather “spoiling” to go to war with Japan.

Q: Was this a common attitude...

GREEN: No, I felt more strongly about these issues than did almost all my US contemporaries. If I could just read from a letter to my father, it will give you a little bit of what I felt. I didn't come across this letter until I was preparing for this interview.

Q: What was the date of this letter?

GREEN: The date of the letter is August 8, 1940. After deploring widespread isolationism in the United States, including my father to some extent and certainly many of my classmates of Yale, I went on to write: “Isn't it strange that the usually impetuous youth, red-blooded, go-getting youth, the back bone of totalitarian parties abroad, in America are so defeatist, so lacking in the qualities which built our nation. We are over civilized”—these are my words—”Over-humored by the good fortune to which we have fallen heir.

Where the youth of other lands are aggressive, we are retracting, and our doom, like that of the Greek and Roman civilizations, is sealed when we produce, in our declining years, men not willing to fight for what they have. American support for material aid to the Allies comes from older men, wiser men, like Nicholas Murray Butler [Chancellor of Colombia University at the time] or Henry Stimson [former Secretary of War and of State], and, please note, World War veterans, such as General Pershing. But from the youth, only isolated instances. I have read with delight the opinions of many of our university presidents, leading educators, novelists, and journalists and with equal disgust the opinions of the youth they instruct. I tell you, it is a dangerous condition that we are in, when a nation-wide appeal for enlistments brings in only 9,000 enlistees, of which only a fraction are able to meet the physical requirements. Conscription we must have and will have. It is the only way, maybe, that we can condition our cloistered, theorizing youth to realities." So, these were my thoughts.

Q: Fairly strongly expressed.

GREEN: I felt very strongly about it.

Q: It's hard to recapture how the "America First" and others felt. It's difficult...

GREEN: They divided our class at Yale very sharply. In 1939 we could see the war coming. We had already seen what Neville Chamberlain [British Prime Minister] had said and done and how the German occupation had affected Czechoslovakia. But we had the "America Firsters," as some of them were called, and Father Coughlin, and some of that group...

Q: Father Coughlin of Detroit, a Catholic priest.

GREEN: Yes. These were people that I just loathed. I was quite strongly pro-Roosevelt, because I could see that he was carefully and conscientiously girding and conditioning America to the realities of having to go to war.

Q: You say you saw Grew's diaries. Did he discuss in those diaries where Japan and America were moving during the time you were there? How did he feel about the situation?

GREEN: I believe he was projecting events over the long term, that he saw that there was enough in common between Japan and the United States—particularly the Japanese he knew. He could see that their way of thinking of the world was very much the same as his own and that of his friends back in the States. He felt that if we could only get rid of the damnable Japanese “war machine,” things would improve. Meanwhile, and this is an important thing to remember, although most people forget it. The Japanese people were getting fed up with their long bloody war with China. They'd lost several million men—or perhaps hundreds of thousands would be a safer figure to use.

Q: It was not an easy war for them.

GREEN: No! Every family in Japan had been affected by war.

Q: And the Chinese fought a lot harder than they're given credit for.

GREEN: That's right. Oh, the casualty rates were terrible. The Japanese were really suffering and they were having to “pinch” all the time—”onion peel” as they say. So the anti-war sentiment in Japan was potentially powerful. Now Ambassador Grew realized this. I don't think that Dr. Stanley Hornbeck fully appreciated that, nor did most Americans. When you do realize that, then there's a certain realism to Grew's thought that for by keeping negotiations going, then the anti-war sentiment in Japan would continue to grow to the point where there would be a possible breakthrough between the leaderships of our two countries. In that way, there could be peace. So I don't think that Ambassador Grew was unrealistic about the possibility of peace. What I am saying is that I don't think that a successful secret meeting between [Japan Prime Minister] Prince Konoye and President Roosevelt was possible. They could have gotten together, but to have such a meeting in

secret? No. It was unrealistic to think that the Japanese Army would even allow this to happen. They would certainly have “bolted” and taken over power.

Now [a rapprochement between Japan and the United States] might have been achieved in a certain way. Grew was trying to work toward that end. People like Bob Fearey and others believed that Grew's proposal [for a meeting between Konoye and Roosevelt] was a fairly realistic one and might have worked. I don't entirely agree with that.

Q: Even if there had been a Konoye-Roosevelt meeting, the Japanese Army had shown that it was quite willing to go in and assassinate him.

GREEN: That's right. And you have to remember this, too. The senior Japanese Army officers had to think about the younger officers, the “hot heads,” under them.

Q: They had just...

GREEN: These young officers were a pretty bloodthirsty lot. Once they had tasted blood and become accustomed to “ruling the roost,” they would have become very difficult to control. Anything that looked like “appeasement,” even if the top military people had condoned it, which is totally unlikely—but if they had, you still had the problem of the younger officers. And that came up in the February 26 incident, when some of the lower-ranking officers took over control of Tokyo, for a short time, revolting against their superiors.

Q: What year was that?

GREEN: 1936.

Q: Talking about various groups, we had our China specialists, who basically came out of missionary families. You had Eugene Dooman and others, who also came out of missionary families, too. However, they had two very different outlooks. While you were in

Japan, was there ever any effort to get American Chinese and Japanese specialists to get together and talk?

GREEN: No, not that I was aware of. That's a good question, because I think that nowadays the first thing that we would do would be to try to get them together. Of course, we were handicapped by travel considerations before World War II, in view of the distances involved.

Q: It was very difficult.

GREEN: However, it is true that we would have benefited a great deal from the kinds of meetings we later had. We have had regular Chiefs of Mission meetings since World War II. We didn't have that kind of opportunity earlier.

Q: Because of considerations of money and so forth.

GREEN: However, I don't think that the “pro-Japanese crowd” [in the State Department prior to World War II]—the people with experience in Japan—could possibly have stood up to Stanley Hornbeck, who was too powerful for them.

Q: Well, this is a question which came up at a later date—and not too much later—in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs, under Walter Robertson. That bureau, from time to time, has been “dominated” by one person.

GREEN: That's right. It has been, although I don't think that I “dominated” it when I was head of it.

Q: When you get someone who is almost an “ideologue” in there. Now, returning to your experience, because someone else can review how Grew operated during the time when you weren't with him. You left Tokyo in May, 1941. First of all, how did you return to the United States?

GREEN: I came back on one of the “President” liners—the “President Coolidge.”

Q: What were you “after” at that point?

GREEN: I was coming back to take the Foreign Service exam. I went to a “cram school” for a month or so—didn't get anything out of it—and took the exam. I just barely “squeaked” through. Then came the war. I was going to be drafted. So I saw an opportunity to enlist in the Navy, in the Japanese language school, and I took it. So that's how I moved from Tokyo into the Navy, within eight months.

Q: Where did you go to the language school?

GREEN: At that time [1942] the school was located in Berkeley, California. This was a “crash” course which had been launched, I'd say, at some point in 1941. I got into the second group that went through the course. The groups at that time were rather small. The course lasted for about a year, during which you were supposed to learn Japanese, I wouldn't say that they turned out people who were proficient in Japanese, although we had some very bright students. Our Navy made a mistake in not accepting Japanese-Americans as language officers since most had some knowledge of the language and some were bilingual. This all reflects the bad prejudices against all Japanese, whatever their status and however long Japanese descendants had lived in the US

What was worse for us at Boulder was the order by President Roosevelt (and urged by General DeWitt) that all Japanese-Americans had to be relocated 200 miles East from our Pacific coast. This included our Japanese-American teachers, requiring us to move the whole language school to the University of Colorado in Boulder. That's where I completed my year of training.

Q: We know by experience today that one year isn't going to do a great deal...

GREEN: No. No. It doesn't help much. You are immediately thrown into the fray. Of our class of about 30 students 27 went into Combat Intelligence with a short period of training in Hawaii before going out to the Pacific Islands. Three of us were sent to Washington to serve in ONI, the Office of Naval Intelligence. That's where I was located all during the war, except for the last year of the war, when I moved into “Communications Intelligence.” This office is still on Nebraska Avenue, NW

For me it was really a fascinating period. I did make one trip, for several months, to the CBI theater.

Q: That's the “China-Burma-India” theater.

GREEN: That's right. But basically I was always here in Washington. I was not interpreting. I was translating—lots and lots of documents, some of them fascinating. I was once given documents we took out of the I-1 submarine sunk off Guadalcanal. This was a bunch of oil-soaked documents flown to Washington, to the Naval laboratories in Anacostia, MD. I worked for several days and translated this stuff. It was absolutely fascinating. The Chief Engineer of the I-1 submarine kept careful records of all of the ships that were being built in Japan for the submarine fleet, both the coastal and seagoing types. All the names were listed down one side of the document followed by the specifications of each ship, both those that were afloat and those that were being built—and where they were being built: Ominato, Jure, Yokosuka, and Sasebo.

So on this great, pullout sheet, with a minimum amount of effort, I was able to get all of the details of the Japanese submarine fleet. We put out two “Fleet Bulletins” on the basis of that. That's one thing that I was able to accomplish. It was very typical of my whole career. I was lucky, just lucky.

Another accomplishment was in communications intelligence, when I got the idea that the “call signals” new ships were using related to their standardize sizes and uses and to

where the Japanese were building them. Therefore, we were able to nail down, merely from call signs, roughly what kinds of ships they were.

Q: You remember the way that the US Navy used to name ships. Battleships were named after states, aircraft carriers after famous battles, and so forth.

GREEN: The call signs were just four letter signals. We would find out, for example, that there were 200 barrels of tung oil loaded at Tientsin aboard “Shiminoseki-7 Maru” with call signal JABC. We had never heard of the “Shiminoseki-7 Maru,” but we could immediately deduce from its call sign the size of the ship and whether it was an oiler or freighter. Of course, that was immediately passed on to our air and naval commands.

Q: After looking at these documents, what was your impression of how the Japanese ran their fleet?

GREEN: One reaction was that their security was terrible. Why they ever allowed their soldiers to carry diaries, with gun positions sketched out in them. Now, I wasn't dealing with that kind of intelligence, but our combat intelligence people were. The second thing was that they had no typewriters of the kind we have. Everything had to be done by longhand and then by mimeograph machine. Well, now, there was a tremendous difference between the way we were doing things and the way the Japanese were doing things. Most insecure of all, the Japanese relied too much on code books which we had already seized.

Q: We are now moving toward the end of World War II. What rank did you have [in the Navy] at the end of the war?

GREEN: I was a full lieutenant.

Q: When did you leave the service?

GREEN: After “V-J Day” in August, 1945, I immediately tried to get into the State Department. The Navy was reluctant to release anybody in intelligence who knew the Japanese language, because they wanted these people for occupation duties and things like that. So it wasn't easy getting out. Meanwhile, I took my Foreign Service oral exam, and the Department accepted me, so I was in the State Department. However, I was still in Navy uniform. My first job in the State Department was to get other naval officers, who were Foreign Service Officers, back into the State Department. I can tell you, to go up to a salt-encrusted Navy captain to try to persuade him to release some of his men back to the State Department wasn't easy. That was my first job.

The files and records in the State Department were in a state of utter chaos. My first job was working under Findley Burns, who was sort of in charge of this whole process of getting people back into the Foreign Service. We had some extraordinary experiences which I won't go into. They're anecdotal.

Q: I don't mind going into them.

GREEN: Well, one person whom we got back was Llewellyn Williams who, we thought, was a Foreign Service Officer. He had the same name as a Foreign Service Officer, but the man we got back—all the way from across the Pacific Ocean—was a young nuclear scientist. When we got him back to Washington, he said, “Well, what am I supposed to do?” We showed him his record, and he said, “I'm not that man.” So we took the matter up with the head of personnel, who decided, “Well, we're going to have to get into the nuclear business, so let's give him a job” in this new-found field of nuclear diplomacy. He was one of the first people involved in this field, simply because of our mistake.

Anyway, I was only in that job for a short while before I was sent to the Legation in Wellington [New Zealand]. Before being commissioned an FSO and sent to Wellington, I had a month's training as an FSR in consular work in the old Soviet Embassy building on Connecticut Avenue.

Q: What was the training like at that time?

GREEN: The training was confined to learning about visas, immigration laws, and consular problems. It was terribly dull. I can't say that I ever mastered it or ever had much use for it. For curious reasons my career has been almost totally focused in the political and especially the politico-military side. That was the “growth industry” at the time.

Q: Shall we move on chronologically or...

GREEN: Let's keep on the “Japan track.”

Q: All right. We'll come back at a later date to review your time in Wellington, New Zealand, and Stockholm. So what was the next...

GREEN: The next “tranche” of my Japan career was when, in 1947, after less than two years as Third and then Second Secretary of Legation in Wellington, New Zealand, I was assigned to the Japan desk in the State Department. I served there from 1947 to 1950 as a Japan desk officer, working very closely with Bob Fearey, who was my successor as Ambassador Grew's private secretary. He had not served in the military because of a detached retina. He probably knew more about current US-Japan relations than anybody in the State Department at that point, because he worked [on Japanese affairs] right on through World War II. Bob and I were very close friends in those years and have been ever since.

We worked under John Allison, who was the “chief” of NA (Northeast Asian Affairs). The deputy “chief” changed and was replaced by Max Bishop. The head of the “bureau”—FE [Far Eastern Affairs]—was W. Walton Butterworth. Walt Butterworth “took a shine” to me, and I found myself in his office a great deal. This created some problems with John Allison, who was diplomatic enough to know how to handle that one. Anyway, it was

largely through Walt Butterworth that I was assigned as George Kennan's only traveling companion to Japan in February, 1948.

This trip turned out to be extremely important. What had happened was that when the occupation of Japan was undertaken in 1945, it was our expectation that it would only go on for two or three years, and then there would be a peace treaty. Meanwhile, to jump ahead a little, John Foster Dulles had been “brought aboard” in 1950 to try to negotiate the peace treaty with Japan. Until there was a peace treaty, Japan would be under Allied occupation. Since it appeared that the occupation period was going to be extended much longer than had earlier been anticipated, it was strongly felt in the Office of Policy Planning in the State Department, especially by George Kennan, but also by John Davies, Walt Butterworth and Secretary of State George Marshall, that occupations can go sour. It was felt that, in the case of Japan, we had to be very careful.

So George Kennan was sent out to Japan in February 1948 by Secretary of State Marshall to discuss with General MacArthur how the emphasis in the occupation of Japan could be shifted from “reform” to “economic recovery.” The idea was to normalize things as far and fast as one could to stave off growing, nationalistic resentment against the occupation.

At that time we had various mechanisms for dealing with Japan and with the occupation. In Washington there was the Far Eastern Commission, on which all of the countries that had been enemies of Japan had their representatives. We met in the old Japanese Embassy here in Washington about once every two or three weeks. I used to go to those meetings. Another international mechanism was the Allied Council in Japan, on which representatives of the Great Powers sat. It met periodically and discussed the broader issues. However, neither of those bodies carried any weight with MacArthur. MacArthur “ran the show” the way he wanted to, and to heck with all these other people. He had a little bit of the same attitude toward the White House. He felt that Japan was his exclusive domain. Of course, we came to learn a lot about that in Korea later on.

Now, when George Kennan was sent out to Japan to talk to MacArthur about changing the emphasis of the occupation, he was treated, on his arrival in Japan, just as though he was a visitor from a not too friendly power. He was almost seen as a “spy” from the State Department. MacArthur held him at arm's length. Of course, he couldn't ignore Kennan. George Kennan had his orders, but MacArthur kept him at arm's length and wouldn't meet with him, except socially—for example at a dinner party.

It was interesting to see how Kennan operated. Kennan got through to MacArthur two ways. The State Department already had a representative in Japan in SCAP [Supreme Commander, Allied Powers] headquarters, William Sebald. Bill Sebald was the head of the Diplomatic Section of SCAP. There were 14 Sections in SCAP—including Sebald's Diplomatic Section answerable to Major General Fox who, in turn, was deputy to General Almond, a four-star general, who was chief of staff of SCAP. So the State Department's representative, Bill Sebald was “way down the line.”

George Kennan eventually got through to MacArthur by casually observing to Major General Willoughby, head of SCAP Intelligence, that MacArthur should not be too concerned about the views of the Far Eastern Commission in Washington, whose work was now largely complete. MacArthur was in the best position to judge what now needed to be done in Japan, and Kennan could be of help to MacArthur in getting MacArthur's views across in Washington.

Through Willoughby and through my intervention with General Babcock (an old friend from our service together in the Embassy before the war) it was arranged that Kennan would discuss the origins and current nature of Soviet conduct in the SCAP HQ briefing room where some 100 top brass were present.

I found Kennan's presentation—and I suspect most others attending would agree —absolutely brilliant. It was as though we were at one with eternity like that old

advertisement of the Rosicrucian Society, where an eye is seen, piercing into eternity. Of course, all the clouds rolled in afterwards, but there was a transcending moment of truth.

Now, MacArthur recognized brains when he soon heard about the speech. After that, all doors were open to Kennan. In fact, MacArthur provided us with a railroad carriage of our own to go wherever we wanted to go. I'll come back to what we wanted to talk about, but I just want to say that we did go down to Kyoto, where I was left for a week to write our report at the Miysho Hotel. Meanwhile, Kennan went on to Korea and the Philippines and then came back to Japan, where we rejoined and returned to Washington. I did some of the writing of the report.

To return to the fundamentals of what Kennan was saying to MacArthur. He said that we have to move as far and fast as possible toward a more normal type of relationship with Japan and toward putting Japan much more on its feet and taking care of itself. We must be aware that if we move too slowly, nationalism will overtake us, and heaven knows what will happen. This was always presented in terms suggesting that MacArthur knew this better than he did. Kennan never lectured MacArthur. The kinds of things he wanted to end as quickly as possible—and it was carefully targeted—included the reparations and decartelization programs. He called for an end to the “purges” immediately or as soon as possible. He said that the Japanese should have some kind of economic representation abroad. (This last point I was to take on as my own responsibility and work very hard on it.) Improvements should be made in communications channels. Kennan placed the greatest emphasis on setting up better internal security in Japan. He was appalled to see how the Police Force was all divided up. The Japanese had inadequate means to maintain law and order in the country on a national scale. He made some recommendations on how to strengthen a democratic Police Force and establish a Japanese Coast Guard that could protect Japan against smuggling, illegal entries, and things like that. There was quite a long list of things that had to be done. All I can say is that our report covered all of these points. So we returned to Washington.

Meanwhile, Kennan suffered from a terrible case of ulcers. Walt Butterworth, with my help, really had to put this report through the National Security Council in Washington, which we did.

Let me go back to give you an illustration of one of the things that happened, while it is still clear in my mind. While I was in Kyoto, writing up the report, I was asked by some Navy friends to come down and see the Osaka docks. They thought I would be shocked by what I saw. And there—stacked all down the docks—was dismantled machinery from Japanese industries. The machinery was being greased, crated, and shipped—at great expense and effort—to North China, as part of a reparations program to China. Meanwhile, North China was being overrun by the communists. The whole thing was ridiculous. The American taxpayer was paying for taking machinery out of Japan, which we were meantime supporting, and taking it to China, which was falling into the hands of the communists.

It will not surprise you that Kennan not only spoke extremely effectively but wrote even more effectively. The telegrams which Kennan sent back to Washington were really bristling.

Q: Well, here were MacArthur and Willoughby, who was his "guard dog," you might say. Here were two men with tremendous egos, particularly MacArthur. Here came Kennan—bright, and all that, but was he criticizing MacArthur's handling of the situation?

GREEN: No. What he was saying was that we want MacArthur to remain in charge, but we wanted to anticipate and head off whatever kinds of forces that might undermine his authority and effectiveness. I think that this appealed to MacArthur, because MacArthur was an intelligent man. Now, where we were running up against problems was with the architects of these policies in SCAP headquarters, for example, the Political Section, which was headed by General Whitney...

Q: Courtney Whitney?

GREEN: Yes, Courtney Whitney. His principal deputy was Colonel Kades. These people had been the architects of the “purge program,” for example. They hated to see it dismantled and resisted our efforts to end the purge, even though it was the expressed will of our National Security Council.

Q: Could you explain about the “purge”?

GREEN: The purge involved removing from public office or from top positions of influence, in business or in government, those who were considered to be responsible, in any major way, for the war effort. This meant, basically, anyone in a prominent position was “purged.” Kennan was opposed to this way of tarring everybody with the same brush, without any kind of examination of the individual's record. By the way, he had also been opposed to “war crimes trials,” but they were all over in Japan by the time he got there.

Anyway, I would like to finish the story of the “purge,” because we had difficulty ending it. Meanwhile, Walt Butterworth had been replaced by Dean Rusk in 1949 as Assistant Secretary for Far East Affairs. So after two months of frustrated efforts by Washington to end the purge, Rusk asked me to draft a personal message for Marshall to MacArthur. I thought my draft was “pretty hot stuff,” but Rusk said, “Do you think that this will turn the trick, Marshall?” I said, “No, I don't think so, Mr. Secretary, but this is putting it on the record.” He said, “The object is not to put it on the record. The object is to stop this damned thing.” He added, “I suggest you go back and rewrite this 10-page telegram and make it no longer than a page and a half. Make the point that MacArthur thought originally that the purge should end by this time and that we'd been reluctant as had other governments in the Far Eastern Commission. However, now we've come to see the wisdom of his earlier position, he should go ahead and do it.”

So I wrote the telegram accordingly. I gulped pretty hard because I come from New England, where we have strong consciences. I knew that MacArthur had never said this, but we attributed it to him. That did the trick. The purge was ended 48 hours later. I reminded Dean Rusk about this, many years later. He said, “Marshall, I hope you don't go around telling people that story. It casts me in such a cynical light.” I said, “Not at all, Mr. Secretary. It casts you in the light of somebody who knows how to get things done through diplomacy.”

Q: What was your impression of Kennan? You traveled with him. He was a complex personality. He was my Ambassador in Yugoslavia. I regarded him as a great intellectual, but I was not impressed with him as an Ambassador. How did he strike you?

GREEN: I've always admired his eloquence and his ability to write and speak. His mission to Japan was a great challenge to him. He rose to it, and that's why he succeeded. Now, you know in his “Memoirs,” he recalls all this. He says that he thinks that that trip to Japan was probably the most important thing that he did, after the Marshall Plan. Then he went on to say, “Perhaps it was even more important than the Marshall Plan, in the long run.” So he attached great importance to this, even in retrospect.

It was marvelous to see how he operated. I mentioned how he “co-opted” people on MacArthur's staff who paved his way to MacArthur. But there was also the way that he drafted reports and telegrams. It was something to behold. He would sit down and start dictating. One of my jobs was to “look intelligent.” He would speak to me, while Dorothy Hessman, his secretary, took it all down as a telegram. So he was basically dictating a telegram to Washington while speaking to me. The result was that the telegram had a kind of conversational flow that made it far more effective. When he was through, he didn't have to change a word of it. Articulation is something I admire in any diplomat.

Q: What were you getting? How was the occupation? Did you think that it was close to “going sour?”

GREEN: No, I don't think so. I don't think that it had gone that far. Some of the reforms had been very successful—the land reform, particularly. Wolf Ladejinsky had been largely responsible for that along with Bob Fearey. There were other things that they had done that were successful, and MacArthur himself did very well in his handling of the Emperor and the Japanese people, and the respect that he showed them. This was really most commendable. On the other hand, I do think that Kennan's concerns were valid. We simply had to move, “or else.” We had to move in a timely way. Then you don't have to act out of weakness, in response to demonstrations or protests.

Q: Did you have anything to do with John Foster Dulles at that time?

GREEN: Not on this trip. Of course, John Foster Dulles “came aboard” on the Japanese problem in 1950. It was in the course of that year and the beginning of the next year that he managed to put together the Japanese peace treaty. He handled this issue with great effectiveness. I was, perhaps, the first person to brief him when he came to the State Department. They gave him an office near the Secretary of State's office on the fifth floor of what was called, at that time, the “New State Department Building.”

First of all, we put together briefing papers for him with the help of Bob Fearey and INR (State's intelligence division). I had done the paper on the political situation in Japan and was briefing him on that particular aspect. He was sitting there, in a deep chair—kind of a sofa-like chair—his arms clasped in front of him. His head was nodding. He looked to me as if he was going to sleep. Finally, his breathing got so heavy that I thought that he was asleep. I just tiptoed out of the room. That was my first connection with John Foster Dulles. [Laughter] I didn't have much to do with him because shortly thereafter I went to Sweden. That was the period when most of the work was done on the peace treaty with Japan, with Bob Fearey being Dulles' principal assistant on the critically important and successful project.

Q: What about Japan's role in the Far East? What kind of position did we see for Japan, with the Cold War on?

GREEN: That's a very good question. Actually, I've seen very little written about it. My recollection was that George Kennan favored a “neutral” solution for Japan. Of course, General MacArthur did, too. You'll remember that MacArthur talked about Japan being the Switzerland of the Far East. There was a kind of visionary and unreal “latching on” to this idea of neutrality as the solution to Japan's future, with the United States and other countries serving as guarantors of Japan's neutrality. It was felt that that was the way we should proceed. Of course, that would have fitted in closely with the mood of Japan at the time. Meanwhile, under its constitution, Japan had been denied having armed forces. Of course, much changed with the Korean War. Even so, my own feeling was that this was not a solution for Japan. If you think about the Far East, you have the four great powers of the world there—the United States, China, and Russia, with Japan potentially as one of them. With such power converging around Korea, the idea that anyone was going to respect Japan's neutrality seemed crazy.

The Korean War just rubbed all of that out. If there hadn't been a war in Korea, I don't know what would have happened. Nobody ever knows about things like that.

Q: Were you still on the Japanese desk on June 25, 1950?

GREEN: Yes, I was.

Q: How did the Korean War hit you? Was it a surprise to you?

GREEN: Oh, yes. It was a surprise. I was struck by how little we knew about Korea. In our Office of Northeast Asian Affairs we had one officer working on Korea who knew little about it. The fact of the matter is that, during World War II, when I was in Navy intelligence, nobody in my intelligence circles was concerned with or about Korea. The same was true before that, when I was in Japan with Ambassador Grew. The ignorance

about Korea! Even to this day there is still the supposition that the Chinese Communists first came into the Korean War when MacArthur appeared to be about to cross the Yalu River. The Chinese were across the Yalu River a long time before that. The ignorance about Korea continues to this very day.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, why don't we cut it off at this point? This makes a good point to break off. I thought that we might then take up the period from 1956 to 1960, when you came back to deal with Japanese affairs.

GREEN: Yes, that was a very important period.

Q: I think that you'll be fresher at that point. So we'll do that.

* * * * *

Q: This is Tape 2, Side A, of an interview with Ambassador Marshall Green, still dealing with his connection with Japan. You were talking about your service in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs, 1956-1960, during which time you worked closely with Assistant Secretary Walter H. Robertson. Did Robertson agree with the way Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin thought about the Far East?

GREEN: No, his views were not as antique as that. However, he was a “dyed in the wool” Republican. He was a man who believed very strongly in the “right wing cause” as far as Asia is concerned, but his views were different from, and opposed to, those of Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin. Moreover, he was a very strong upholder of the Foreign Service. It is interesting to note that all 14 of our Chiefs of Mission in East Asia and the Pacific at that time were Foreign Service Officers—a record that probably has never been matched anywhere and at any time in history.

Now, I got along very well with Assistant Secretary Robertson. For one thing, one of my first jobs was running the United Fund Campaign for the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs,

which came out far ahead of its quota. To Assistant Secretary Robertson that was very pleasing and cast me in a favorable light. I also wrote a lot of his speeches. He liked the way that I wrote, and his speeches got good reactions on Capitol Hill [Congress]. In the speeches, of course, I always gave proper play to his known prejudices regarding...

Q: Was it a problem to write speeches for him? You were a professional Foreign Service Officer, close to your political masters, but at the same time...

GREEN: I knew what his strong views and prejudices were. I had to play them up in his speeches, because they were his speeches, after all. I would present the material as I knew that he would present it. It was more in discussions of particular issues, where I was present, that I would sometimes mildly take exception to what he was saying. It was always mild because, if it went too far, that would be the end of my close association with him.

The one time I can recall when he “blew up” was when I took issue with him over something which Syngman Rhee [President of the Republic of Korea] had done regarding the seizure of Japanese fishing vessels. We had tremendous responsibilities in both Korea and Japan. We were doing everything possible to try to bring them together. With Syngman Rhee around, there was no chance of doing that. I felt that this was a primary issue, to which Robertson was giving insufficient attention.

When Robertson left in 1959, Jeff Parsons succeeded him. He was an old like-minded friend and career colleague.

Q: Robertson was focused on Korea and China. We are talking about Japan at that time [1956-1960]. What were his interests and concerns with Japan?

GREEN: I had no difficulties in writing for him or talking with him about Japan. He recognized the primacy of Japan. Our overall relationships with any country in that part of

the world had to be based on a healthy US-Japan relationship. That was something of a concession for a man like Robertson, who put so much emphasis on China.

The Japanese Broadcasting Company recently wanted to interview me about the Security Treaty of 1960 between Japan and the United States. I said that I did not have very clear recollections about that. They replied, “On the contrary. We see you as being a principal architect of that treaty.” I said, “What?” They said, “Yes, let us show you the documents.” Then they showed me documents which they had arranged to have declassified [under the Freedom of Information Act] from our archives. These showed that while working for Robertson I was the one who originated the proposal for the Security Treaty of 1960 between the United States and Japan. It took the form of a 17 page memorandum dated December 28, 1956 [to which the Japan Broadcasting Company referred] addressed to Douglas MacArthur [nephew of Gen. MacArthur], who at that time was Counselor of State Department, and to Bill Sebald, who was then Robertson's deputy in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. What I wrote was something of a reflection of what I had gone through before with George Kennan [in 1948 when he was Director of Policy Planning and with whom I visited Japan]. I pointed out that the Japanese considered our sizable military presence in Japan as a carryover from the occupation period and as a form of foreign control. Furthermore, this presence had the danger of involving Japan in war because we had extensive military bases in Japan which were seen by many Japanese as a kind of a magnet which might draw even nuclear war to Japan. Therefore, our political position in Japan was quite perilous, unless we moved very rapidly to put these bases on a mutually beneficial basis. In other words, we couldn't be “dictating” to Japan. We had to be “consulting” with Japan. I urged that we replace the Security Treaty of 1951 between the US and Japan with a truly mutual security treaty, which eventually became the Security Treaty of 1960 between the US and Japan which is still in force today. Judging from what's happened to NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization], I'd say that it's even more durable than NATO.

This long paper made specific recommendations as to how we should go about negotiating a mutual security treaty with the Japanese and what in general might be the terms of such a treaty. All I can say is that it received the strong endorsement of the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. Later on, actual machinery was established in Japan to negotiate the treaty between our Ambassador in Japan and CINCPAC [Commander in Chief, Pacific, with his headquarters in Honolulu], on the American side, and the Foreign Minister of Japan and the head of their Self-Defense Forces, on the Japanese side. They had all sorts of people down the line, working on this negotiation and finally came up with a very good security treaty.

This was the principal issue regarding Japan during my years from 1956 to 1960 [as Regional Planning Adviser in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs].

Q: Let me focus on what is probably the most difficult, adversarial issue. It was not between Japan and the United States but between the Department of State and the Pentagon—over Okinawa, over bases [in Japan], and all that.

GREEN: Well, I would say, Stu, that ever since the days of General Eisenhower, when he organized the National War College, there have been good working relations between State and Defense. The State Department and the military were prone to sneer at each other—with references made to “the military mind,” and “to cookie pushers” and that kind of thing. After a while, you didn't hear that so much. We had improving personal relationships and mutual interests and we expressed ourselves accordingly.

I think that this was very well reflected when I got back from Sweden where I had been for nearly five years [1950-1955]. It was rather refreshing to find that the military and the State Department were working in more constructive terms, particularly in the case of Japan. The same thing might have been true in terms of Europe as well.

We had an interesting time negotiating the Security Treaty of 1960. Douglas MacArthur had meanwhile ceased to be Counselor of the State Department and had become Ambassador to Japan. He came back to Washington in 1959 to try to get the Joint Chiefs of Staff completely “aboard” on the new Security Treaty. He knew that they were generally supportive but we still had the final steps of the negotiations to complete. Ambassador MacArthur called a meeting in the Secretary of State's conference room, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff on one side of the table. On the State Department's side of the table were Jeff Parsons, who had meanwhile taken over as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs from Walter Robertson; Ambassador MacArthur; myself; and one or two others. MacArthur chaired the meeting.

I'll never forget the meeting, because a rather amusing situation arose. Doug MacArthur, in his didactic way, was telling the Joint Chiefs of Staff about the essence of diplomacy and how to negotiate a treaty. He said, “Gentlemen, it's absolutely essential, when we sit down with the Japanese, that we know exactly what we want to get out of the Japanese. We want to have our whole position worked out and ready. Then we can do a real “snow job” on them.” Admiral Arleigh Burke, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, “You mean, Doug, the way you're doing on us right now?” [Laughter] Well, I was the only one on the State Department side of the table who laughed, though I quickly suppressed it. That was one of the things that I found so delightful about Admiral Arleigh Burke.

Anyway, that treaty was negotiated. I don't want to go into all of the details.

Q: Before we leave that, the United States had major bases in Yokosuka and Atsugi, and Okinawa was off to one side. But these bases must have led to a lot of discussion about what we were going to do with them. Or were our military fairly well...

GREEN: Oh, no, I'm not finished talking about the bases, because they raised critical issues. All of the points you have made are valid. We had various problems with our bases in Japan and the Ryukyus—and we of course had to distinguish between the two, because

the Ryukyus didn't revert to Japan until 1972. At this point we are talking about 1960. The bases in Japan and especially the Ryukyus were also very important to carry out our treaty commitments in other parts of East Asia. To some extent it might appear to our other allies in East Asia that the Japanese had some kind of controlling hand over the use of our facilities in support of missions for the defense of those other countries. That could wreak havoc with the fabric of our relationships with those countries.

The skill was how to come up with a treaty which, on the one hand, comported with Japan's feelings that it did not want to become a “lightning rod,” and that it did want to be able to control all that went on in their country. At the same time there were the views of the countries which were protected by our bases. I think that diplomacy really triumphed in this situation. The negotiations were handled with great skill by the powers that be. I take no credit for this. They were handled by our ambassador, CINCPAC, the Secretary of State, as well as by Japanese Prime Minister Kishi and his officials.

We came up with a formula under which the treaty left it unclear as to the precise extent to which we would be responsive to Japanese requests not to use our bases for particular missions. In essence the formula involved an exchange of letters in Washington at the end of 1960 which stated that in carrying out our missions each of the parties would take into account the concerns of the other party. Whatever we did would comport with Japanese concerns about not having any nuclear weapons in Japan, not drawing Japan into a position of being a “lightning rod,” and so forth.

That was a very sensitive and difficult maneuver and an example of diplomacy at its very best, involving some very good men at the helm in the Foreign Office and the Prime Minister's Office. We had, too, especially Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson, a superb diplomat.

Now, you mentioned something else just now, Stu, which is very close and parallel to this. That is, we had bases throughout East Asia, especially in Japan, Korea and

the Philippines, but increasingly elsewhere in Southeast Asia, including Thailand and, eventually, Vietnam. With all these bases, we inevitably had numerous problems between our forces and the local communities.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Frank Nash, was assigned the task in 1957 of going around the world with specialists in the field of politico-military affairs to see what steps we should take to forestall the dangers of “blowups” as well as to improve, in constructive terms, troop-community relations. I went on a long trip with Frank Nash in May 1957. Also on that trip were Henry L.T. (”Barney”) Koren, Jim Wilson, Len Unger, and Tim Hoopes. I was the specialist for East Asia and the Pacific. The others were more or less European or Defense specialists.

The first country we visited was Japan, where we had a real “blowup” over the so-called Girard case. This involved an enlisted man who had shot a Japanese woman who was collecting brass casings [from shells] on an artillery firing range. The matter blew up overnight into a national scandal. So we had that problem right off the bat. We had a similar case that I have already mentioned in my oral history on China. This had to do with a GI shooting a “peeping Tom” in Taiwan. I won't go into that. We had some similar cases in the Philippines. Overall, the results of this trip, not just to East Asia but other trips to Europe and the Middle East, did a great deal to improve troop-community relations.

However, my real job was that of Regional Planning Adviser. The task of a Regional Planning Adviser was quite clear in Europe where we had the Marshall Plan, NATO, and all other regional organizations. In East Asia we had no regional organizations at all. Therefore, the region contained four divided countries [Korea, China, Vietnam and Laos] and less important countries—Communist China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea—were not represented in the United Nations.

Here let me point out that the only real unifying factor in the East Asian region at that time was the United States which had close ties with most of the countries of the region while

those countries had generally poor or non-existent relations with each other. Moreover, the more responsible we were for the problems of our friends in the region, the less inclined they were to resolve issues with neighboring countries.

Meanwhile between 1952 and 1960, the US had established military alliances with Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China and the Philippines. These were all bilateral alliances and efforts to establish any multilateral alliance in the region never really succeeded. SEATO collapsed, though it did have a legacy of enduring US military ties with Thailand into the Rush-Thanat Agreement.

Q: Getting back to Japan, how did we view the internal situation in Japan from 1956 to 1960? Were there concerns, or...

GREEN: I don't think that there were any major concerns. My recollection of the internal situation in Japan is that we faced some problems regarding the status of the Koreans in Japan. We also had some problems, which I mentioned before, about our base-community relations. However, as far as the Japanese political figures were concerned, the Liberal-Democratic Party was clearly in the saddle. The democratic process in Japan, if you want to call it that—was under the thumb of the well-heeled Liberal-Democratic Party, which was oriented toward the United States. So we didn't have much to worry about. However, the left wing in Japan was vociferous and could whip the people up, as indeed it did, on the military base issue. So the situation was nothing to take for granted. We worried about it a good deal. It was an incentive for us to move forward on the recommendations I mentioned earlier about the need to enter into a more truly bilateral mutual security relationship with Japan.

Q: Was this the time when the Zengakuren, a radical student movement, emerged? At that time were we concerned about some of the groups in Japan really going “off?”

GREEN: Undoubtedly, we were, although I can't remember which they were. I know that there were some troublesome groups.

Q: Was part of your job—and this was clearly its politico-military dimension—involved in developing the position of Political Advisers?

GREEN: That's a good point. I think that the idea originated with Bill Sebald. Bill Sebald was a close friend of Admiral Arleigh Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations, who, in turn, was a close friend of Admiral Felix Stump, who was CINCPAC. Admiral Stump was a touchy salt-crusted sailor, who had the same kind of suspicious attitude toward the State Department that military officers of his vintage—he was well on in years—commonly had. The idea of having anybody from the State Department “snooping” on him or keeping an eye on him was disturbing to him.

We got around this problem through the diplomacy of Admiral Arleigh Burke. Arleigh sent a personal message to Admiral Stump, saying, more or less, “Felix, we think that you have one of the most important jobs in the world. In addition to having the best in the way of staff, you ought to have somebody on your staff who knows how to get things done for you in the State Department. We have such a fellow in mind. His name is John Steeves.” Sebald and I had recommended that John Steeves [later Ambassador to Afghanistan and Director General of the Foreign Service] be Admiral Stump's first Political Adviser. Well, to make a long story short, Felix Stump got along beautifully with John Steeves, and vice versa. That was the beginning of a string of Political Advisers, all of whom did very well.

Admiral Felix Stump was also very useful in this period in connection with something else. In September, 1957, the Russians put up “Sputnik,” [the world's first man-made satellite]. Secretary of State Dulles was extremely concerned over this development and the implication that we were falling behind the Soviet Union in the “race for space,” as well as the “race for science and technology.” Dulles put out a circular asking each

of the bureaus of the Department for suggestions as to how we might counteract this development.

Psychologically, there was need for counteraction, because in the world at large the Russians appeared to be moving ahead of us. People might begin to knuckle under to the Russians, thinking that they were the “wave of the future.” I don't know whether the idea was John Steeves' or Arleigh Burke's or Felix Stump's. However, let's give Admiral Felix Stump credit for it because he was the one who carried it out.

The idea was that, once a year, Admiral Arleigh Burke would conduct an air-sea-ground demonstration in East Asia. The demonstration would be carried on by the Seventh Fleet, with Admiral Stump as the host. He then invited the Defense Ministers and the Chiefs of Staff of all of the countries in East Asia to attend. Most of them came. The demonstration started at Clark Field [in the Philippines], went from there to Subic Bay and Cubi Point [also in the Philippines], and ended up in fleet exercises en route to Okinawa, where there were Marine Corps “vertical envelopment” exercises [helicopter insertion of troops on a given point], for the edification of these leaders. On top of it all the Navy was able to demonstrate how quickly it could bring reinforcements and supplies into the Far East from the West Coast of the United States, as well as from Hawaii. It was very impressive, and I think that it left a very deep mark on all of his guests, that the US was a powerful friend who could deliver.

Q: Looking at some of the things that you were involved with, was there a Japanese connection with the Taiwan Straits crisis of 1958?

GREEN: Yes, I think that there was. The Japanese were very nervous about Taiwan, bearing in mind that Taiwan used to be part of the Japanese Empire, and the Japanese are very conscious of being on a long chain of Islands running South from the Kuril Islands right down to Taiwan.

Q: During this time, 1956-1960, did you feel that the Japanese, in some sense, were "coming of age?" They had been through this traumatic war [World War II], we had occupied their country, and...

GREEN: Yes, they were coming of age, but still very slowly. We're talking now about the period 1956-1960. The Japanese were still "reeling" from the effects of the American occupation. The 1960 US-Japan Mutual Security Treaty was yet to be finalized. They were beginning to make real strides forward economically, but as you know, this process moved rather slowly in the beginning. It wasn't until 1961 or 1962 that the Japanese economy began to boom. It was a bit later that they began to score very rapid increases in their GNP [Gross National Product].

Q: How effective was their Foreign Service, their representation abroad and especially in Washington? I'm trying to keep it to the 1956-1960 period. We'll talk about later periods at another time.

GREEN: They had very good people. Incidentally, during that period, when Prime Minister Kishi came to Washington in 1957, there was no official Japanese-American organization here, as there had been in Japan for many years. So Kishi had no suitable organization in Washington to serve as host for an occasion where he could deliver a major speech on US-Japan relations (as Grew had done in Japan under the auspices of the American-Japan Society in Tokyo).

So, three of us Foreign Service Officers in the Far East Bureau (all specialists on Japanese issues) undertook to establish the Japan-American Society of Washington, DC which then hosted a dinner party for Kishi. (The Society was to flourish over time, later headed by Alexis Johnson whom I succeeded as President in 1985.)

Q: Did the Japanese Embassy [in Washington] and visiting Japanese cabinet ministers who came over—did they know how to "play" Congress?

GREEN: Well, I'm not sure that they knew how to “play” Congress. They included able and experienced diplomats who were true professionals, albeit somewhat reticent about promoting their points of view directly with our Congress. They rather looked to the State Department to front for them.

Q: During this period and still concerning Japan, how well do you think our policy was supported by the CIA, as far as intelligence went?

GREEN: The CIA? I think that our policy was pretty well supported. However, there is one weakness about the Agency which was disturbing to me. That is, they tended to get involved in doing things which, if they ever became publicly known, would have been deeply embarrassing to the United States. In other words, they interfered in the Japanese electoral process. They did this in Japan and they did it in the Philippines. When I became Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, I saw to it that there would be no more of that. I think that it is a very poor idea for the Agency ever to get involved in the internal politics of foreign countries.

Q: It is counterproductive.

GREEN: Especially in democracies.

Q: Perhaps it is a matter of “don't just stand there—do something.”

GREEN: Yes. The CIA was involved in Japan in this sense. As it turned out, there was an article in the press a few months ago about this involvement. I was surprised and shocked to read about it. I didn't know that there had been such involvement.

Q: Then why don't we move on to the next subject? Is there anything else that you wanted to cover?

GREEN: Yes. The Soviet Union and the relationship of the communists in Japan to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union played its cards vis-a-vis Japan just about as badly as it could. That was a real blessing to us. Consider that when the US-Japan Security Treaty was being negotiated the communists, the socialists, and a lot of the intellectuals were urging a foreign policy of neutrality for Japan. But the Russians came through with threats which really made such a policy impossible, quite apart from the record of Korea itself. You would have thought that once the Russians saw how much success our mutual security treaty had achieved in US-Japanese relations, they would have seen the wisdom of turning back at least some of these islands in the northern territories of Japan. This is something they have never done—even to this day. They have never understood that by simply turning over these woebegone islands they could have gained an opportunity for getting loans, investments, and a peace treaty with Japan. They still don't have a peace treaty. The Russians acted in ways that made our job easier in Japan.

Q: Obviously, the Kuril Islands...

GREEN: Well, the southern Kuril Islands.

Q: What was our reading of why the Soviets wouldn't turn these islands over to Japan?

GREEN: That was hard to understand, because we're talking about four islands. Two of them are fairly large, but all are without resources except their proximity to fishing grounds, valuable to the Japanese. The Russians had more territory than they could ever use. By turning back these islands to Japan they would gain all kinds of opportunities...

Q: Was it submarine passage or something like that?

GREEN: There were several available passages for Soviet vessels going through the Japanese chain of islands. Evidently the Russians were (and still are) opposed to any territorial concessions lest this constitutes a bad precedent elsewhere along the borders

of Russia—and it was probably an issue of special sensitivity to the Soviet (now Russian) armed forces.

Q: This subject has always been a source of puzzlement to me. Talk about a cheap way of winning some points.

Now we're returning to the time when you were returning from Korea in 1962, was it? Then you were...

GREEN: No. I went from Korea around Thanksgiving Day in 1961 to Hong Kong as Consul General. I was Consul General there for about a year and a half when I was called back to Washington.

Q: Let's take that period. When was that? 1962?

GREEN: I came back to Washington in 1963 to be Deputy Assistant Secretary, basically to take a long, hard look at China policy. However, after President Kennedy was assassinated [in 1963], it was clear that we couldn't get some of our major proposals through our government, although we almost got liberalization of travel to all countries, removing any restrictions on travel. However, ARA [Bureau of American Republic Affairs], claimed that this would upset their understandings with the Organization of American States. So we never got that one through. Meanwhile, Vietnam was increasingly taking up everybody's time.

During this period from 1963 to 1965 when I was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, my concerns with Japan were really quite secondary. In fact, it's rather hard for me to remember some of the things that we did at that time.

I remember one meeting we had at the Chiefs of Mission Conference in 1971 in Baguio [Philippines], where Armin Meyer, our Ambassador to Tokyo, made a very “upbeat” presentation on Japan. It certainly pictured Japan as our most important partner in the

world. Our Ambassador in Korea, Bill Porter, really “savaged” Ambassador Meyer on that. He made a long, fairly sarcastic and sometimes humorous reply to Armin Meyer, asking what the Japanese were doing for us. What burdens were they carrying? What is their attitude toward the world and toward Korea—which had been the object of Japanese contempt for a long time. Ambassador Porter was speaking like a Korean.

Q: But in a way, isn't there a considerable kernel of truth in this? In the case of those two countries, China and Japan, haven't we had something of a “love-hate” relationship? But the “love” relationship gets more involved. It strikes me that we really weren't asking much of Japan.

GREEN: No, we weren't asking much of Japan. We could see that Japan was going to be terribly important in the future. Its GNP was rising very rapidly with growth rates running around 9% a year. Japan loomed as the major contributor to economic development support programs for East Asia and even for Africa and other parts of the world. We saw Japan in those terms.

During these years we also developed closer contacts with the Japanese Foreign Ministry. When I was Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bill Bundy [the Assistant Secretary] had meetings quite often with the Japanese. That was a system which I carried on later. In fact, during Bill Bundy's tenure as Assistant Secretary, I was more or less the person representing the Bureau of East Asian Affairs on all issues relating to Northeast Asia, because he was so involved with Vietnam and Southeast Asia. I was virtually the Assistant Secretary for Northeast Asia, as he was for Southeast Asia, except when he would go on a trip, I would have to take over his problems, and vice versa. He and I were a very close team. We had gone to school and college together and traveled to Europe together between our graduation from Groton and arrival at Yale. So we knew each other very well.

I would say that there was a lot of forward motion in Northeast Asia during that period. The growth figures, of course, would show that. While we felt that Japan could do more to help

developing countries, its “rate of donations” was greatly improved over what it had been earlier on. We were grateful for that. Furthermore, on the diplomatic side Japan was eager to play a more active economic and developmental role in all parts of the world, including in Afro-Asian affairs. As I was to find out in Indonesia, Japan was able to help out in these aid donor groups. Japan was “coming of age”—that's all, though it had a ways to go.

We had these annual meetings with the Japanese Foreign Ministry. I remember attending one such meeting during this period in Williamsburg, VA. I also went to Japan as the chief of our delegation to a meeting with the Japanese up in Miyanoshita, near Mt. Fuji. We and our Japanese Foreign Office counterparts felt that we had a common stake in the world, with the US coming to depend more and more on Japan, particularly in economic terms. We also saw advantages for all concerned in the United States-Japan Mutual Security Treaty, because it provided a kind of protection for everybody, including, paradoxically, China and Russia. So the Japan-America relationship was highly “stabilizing” in that part of the world.

Q: In some countries you can talk to the Foreign Ministry, but they just don't play any significant role in their government. There is a sort of “disconnect” involved. With Japan did you find that the Foreign Ministry played a strong role, as did the State Department, with some exceptions, in our government regarding foreign policy?

GREEN: The officials of the Japanese Foreign Ministry were very important within the Japanese Government because, first of all, the ministry contained many of Japan's elite. They were extremely well educated. They had good foreign connections, with Japan heavily dependent on other countries, both politically and, of course, economically. The problems we had with Japan at that time were not so much directly with Japan. They were largely subjected to third countries problems.

Japan was worried about our relationship with China. They were worried about our relationship with Southeast Asia, especially Vietnam. They were worried that the United

States was going to draw Japan into “dicey” situations. When they read about how our Congress and Washington in general behaved, they weren't always sure that we would act sensibly in crises. If we did wrong or guessed wrong, Japan would be drawn into the vortex. So these are the kinds of things that bothered the Japanese.

Q: Could you “allay” these concerns at all?

GREEN: Yes, we allayed them by consultations—real consultations. Before we did anything, we made a practice of letting them know. We would try to get their agreement. That's how this whole question came up of not having gained their support when President Nixon went to China. This was such a major irritant in our relationship, because we'd been telling the Japanese, year after year, to stay with us on the Chinese representation issue. They did. They “played ball” with us, though they were very anxious to trade with China. We advised them to “go easy” and so forth. So we had a staying hand on their wrist. And all of a sudden, without telling them, we got to Peking first.

Q: This was when you were Assistant Secretary?

GREEN: I was Assistant Secretary. We'll come back to that, of course. I've been jumping ahead. I was simply trying to say that the whole question of consultations developed during the period we're talking about—1963 to 1965. This was part of the formative period in the consultations process.

Q: When you were Deputy Assistant Secretary, what was your feeling about President Johnson's interest in Japan?

GREEN: I'm not sure whether I remember much about President Johnson's interest in Japan. I don't remember his being that much concerned with Japan.

Q: Well, that's an answer.

GREEN: I remember talking with President Johnson about Indonesia and about how important Japan was as the principal economic supporter of Indonesia. I also told him that I consulted with my Japanese colleagues, whom I'd known very well. This became kind of a way to “get through” to Sukarno. Sukarno's Japanese wife was a close friend of the Japanese Ambassador to Indonesia, who then introduced me to her. Of course, LBJ was primarily concerned with our growing involvement in the wars in Indochina, and he must have become aware of the fact that any heavy bombing of Asians in Southwest Asia was likely to be deeply disturbing to Asians elsewhere, including Japan. The Japanese government cooperated with us in not raising major obstacles to our military operations in Indochina, but they did this with many reservations and considerable reluctance.

Q: There were those who felt that there was a certain amount of racism in that situation.

GREEN: That's right.

Q: I wonder whether we might not stop at this point.

GREEN: OKAY.

Q: We'll pick it up the next time, because it's another long period of time, when you were Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. Unless there's something that you would like to raise.

* * * * *

Q: Today is March 10, 1995. We're moving to the period of the Japanese connection when you were Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific in Washington. This was 1969-1973. Let's talk about Japan. When you took over this position in 1969, how did you view Japan as a factor in our foreign relations at that time?

GREEN: I had already had several assignments related to Japan. Japan had been a thread throughout my career. During the period from 1969 to 1973 I saw Japan as increasingly important on the world scene, and especially in East Asia. I saw the primacy of the US-Japan security relationship in the broadest sense of the word. We had a common goal. Many objectives on the world scene were shared objectives. Japan had the technological and economic strength. We had a lot of that but we also had the military strength. Therefore, by working in unison, with each country participating to the maximum extent in accordance with its special strengths, we could make quite a mark on the world in terms of peace and progress. Not for any expansionist reasons but simply for improving conditions of life for the people of the world.

Q: We're talking about 1969, when you became Assistant Secretary. This was...

GREEN: The first experience I had with Japan in 1969 right after I was appointed Assistant Secretary by President Nixon, was in the course of a trip through the whole of East Asia, meeting with the various national leaders, all of which I've covered in the book I co-authored entitled War and Peace with China.

As Assistant Secretary-designate, I visited Japan in April 1969 at the end of a long trip through East Asia. My purpose was principally to convey to Japanese leaders impressions of my trip and to answer questions about President Nixon's views. This segment of my trip was very much like the others. In Japan my pitch was that we would stand by our commitments and that we considered our security treaty with Japan to be the keystone of our whole security position in that part of the world, and so forth.

I also mentioned a number of things about the countries of the area being in a better position to “fend for themselves.” I also explained the Vietnamization program, which was already under way, involving turning over more responsibilities to the Vietnamese. So that was my first connection with Japan during the Nixon administration, when I met the leaders.

The second contact with Japan during my time as Assistant Secretary was very closely related to the first one. That concerned “The Nixon Doctrine” itself. You remember that “The Nixon Doctrine” originated on July 25 [1969], when the President was making a trip around the world. He stopped off in Guam and had a background press conference at the Top-of-the-Mar Hotel.

In this press conference President Nixon expressed what became known as “The Nixon Doctrine.” Well, along with Bob Barnett, I had written the “scope paper” for his trip through Asia in July [1969]. In this paper I suggested that the President say many of the things that I had mentioned earlier on in March and April [1969] about the countries of the area being in a better position to fend for themselves.

In his backgrounder, the President put his emphasis more on military affairs, on our defense commitments, and on our progress to help strengthen the defense capabilities of our friends and allies. However, it was the primary responsibility of each country to provide for its own defense, to the maximum extent possible. We could only provide assistance in a supplementary sense.

Quite frankly, this had a lot to do with Japan, because in the scope paper that Bob Barnett and I had written for the President's trip around the world we emphasized the fact that these countries were “more on their feet” these days, with Japan beginning to provide economic assistance, as indeed it had in Indonesia, where they were giving just as much assistance as we were. Later on, they gave more. My idea of “The Nixon Doctrine” tracked back, in many ways, to Japan.

The Japanese reaction to the Nixon Doctrine was generally favorable. They formally expressed their complete support several months later, in November [1969], when Prime Minister Sato gave what he called “The New Pacific Age” speech, which was a distinct reflection of the Nixon Doctrine. The whole concept of this speech concerned the United

States working together with Japan and in support of the economic development and progress of all of East Asia.

The United States and Japan were further drawn together, I would say, by the Nixon Doctrine and what it expressed. The reactions of some of the other countries of East Asia were generally good, but they were nervous, fearing that the United States was preparing a rationale for minimizing its assistance to them. So I had a great deal of difficulty in reassuring the countries concerned that we were not “getting out.” Once again, I talked about other countries (like Japan) being in a position to do more. As economic development progressed, the countries that were doing the best were in a position to help other friendly nations.

Incidentally, after the President gave his backgrounder to the press in Guam, he said that I would be prepared to answer further questions. Well, I didn't know what he had said not having been invited up to the press conference. It was a little embarrassing for me because I then had to brief the press both at the next stop, which was Manila, and then in Jakarta.

The press kept asking questions about what had gone on at the summit meetings between Nixon and Marcos in the Philippines and Nixon and Suharto in Indonesia. Since nobody in the State Department, including the Secretary of State, was present at those meetings, only President Nixon, Kissinger, and the head of government concerned knew what the President had said. The press people were not interested in general background. They wanted to know precisely what was said. All I had was a slip of paper from someone on one or two points that I could make. Probably, Ron Ziegler [President Nixon's press spokesman] got this slip of paper from Henry Kissinger. That was about it. It was very embarrassing for me. I recall that “Newsweek” magazine came out with an article, saying that my briefing in Manila was very much like a travel lecture. That was about all I could do.

Q: You were the principal person dealing with Asian affairs at that time and you had largely spent your career dealing with Asian matters. How did you feel about Kissinger's views on Asia at the beginning of the Nixon administration?

GREEN: I saw a good deal of Kissinger during 1969. I could sense increasingly that he wanted to have nothing to do with the State Department and that he was going to "run" foreign policy. I realized that I was going to be his principal victim as the Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific, the area which was primarily "on the block" at that time. I could see that I was going to spend a lot of time dealing with an evasive White House. Another thing that bothered me, since we are talking about Japan, is that the only person Kissinger had on his staff who knew anything about Japan was Dick Sneider [a Foreign Service Officer and later Ambassador to Korea]. Shortly after that Dick Sneider found that he couldn't get along with Kissinger and was assigned to Japan. After that, they had nobody on the White House staff who had real Japanese experience. The Japan factor wasn't adequately considered in a series of situations that were to arise.

Q: As I do these interviews, there is one thing that comes through. That is, first, Henry Kissinger was very "bright." However, and secondly, there were areas that he didn't know very much about and relied on his "brightness." Often, it didn't work out very well. Africa was one such area. Latin America was another...

GREEN: I think that Kissinger had lots of gaps in his knowledge of the world. He was a splendid tactician. In a given situation he knew how to maneuver very well indeed. He also is very good at briefing and is highly articulate. These were his strengths. However, depth of knowledge about East Asia, no. He had none. I think that his failure to draw upon the expertise of people who had spent their lives working on East Asia was a great mistake on his part. That is not the way we should run a government. To pay these people for all of those years of work and then not use them is pointless—worse than pointless.

Another problem is one that nobody ever speaks about. Let me mention it right now. When you are “cut out” of things, the way other people and I were “cut out” of them, and you know that you are being “cut out,” you begin to lose confidence in yourself, because you know that you don't have all the threads in your hand. You don't have the complete picture. Meanwhile, Kissinger knew that you didn't have the complete picture, and therefore he tended to discredit your views accordingly. It ended up by nobody really knowing what the other person knew or didn't know. It's a very bad way of running a government.

Q: Because the information flow must be “up and down.”

GREEN: Right. He was playing his proper role of maneuvering and conducting certain kinds of delicate negotiations. However, with the assistance of key people in the State Department, we would not have made some of the mistakes that we made. Furthermore, we would have had a strong, effective foreign policy because it was headed by a man [President Nixon] who came into office, probably knowing more about foreign affairs than any president in history. We had a wonderful opportunity but, of course, a lot of that was not properly used. We could have done much better.

Q: As we keep our focus on Japan from 1969 through 1973, what do you think were some of the major developments?

GREEN: I would say that the two major developments were the opening to China and the “reversion” of the Ryukyu Islands to Japan. I would also mention the Nixon Doctrine and the related Vietnamization program as being a fundamental development. So those were the principal developments during the Nixon administration that related to Japan.

Q: Let's talk about China. One of the great moments in the Nixon administration was the opening to China after many years of isolation between the United States and China, although there had been contacts. You've already talked about the US and China. How about the Japan factor? What were some of the points that you were concerned with?

GREEN: The July 15, 1971 announcement by President Nixon in California of his intended trip to China (following Kissinger's successful earlier trip to China) produced a deep shock in Japan. This was known in Japan as the first of several Nixon “shocks.” This reaction is very understandable if you bear in mind that the United States and Japan had a partnership. No third country was more important to the United States and Japan than China. That the President should suddenly announce this surprise visit, reversing policies which we had been pursuing for a long time, was deeply embarrassing to the government of Prime Minister Sato. One of the things we must remember was the fact that, year after year, the United States had been trying to keep communist China out of the United Nations. Sentiment in Japan had been rather favorable toward the People's Republic of China as being a member of the United Nations. We had kept Japan “in line” on this issue. When we suddenly announced that President Nixon was going to go to China, it also looked as though we were “abandoning” Taiwan, which had been a Japanese territory at one time and where the Japanese had enormous interests. Taiwan is very close to Japan. All of this boded ill to Japan.

However, above all, this subject was what was known as “Asakai's nightmare.” Asakai was the Japanese Ambassador to Washington [at the time of the Nixon announcement]. His nightmare was that he would wake up one morning and find that the United States was represented in Peking. All of this put Japan in a terribly difficult position. It left the Japanese Government—and Prime Minister Sato in particular—with a feeling that they had been worsted, that Sato himself had been overshadowed by Nixon, that we were not reliable partners, and that we didn't consult, when consultations are fundamental to any viable relationship. The Japanese felt that we were committed to consult on all issues and hadn't done so. As a result, the reaction in Japan [to the Nixon announcement] was quite severe, at first. I don't think that the White House had really thought about this.

When Secretary of State Rogers called up on July 15, shortly after the President had made his announcement on television, to ask me and Jack Irwin, the Deputy Secretary of

State, how we felt about the news, I said that it was “great but what about Japan?” Rogers said, “Well, what about Japan?” I said, “The Japanese are going to take this terribly hard.” Rogers said, “But we gave them advance notice.” I said, “You gave them an hour or two advance notice, but that's not much advance notice, and that's not consultations.” I said that we were going to have a severe problem with Japan.

At that point I said that Dick Ericson and I would draft a message of explanation from the President to Prime Minister Sato and get it to the President by telex immediately. So Nixon sent that message to Sato. It was an effort to try to placate the Japanese. When we were in Peking, as I said in my book on the subject, as well as, I think, in my oral history of the time, there were indications that Peking was very concerned about the US-Japanese relationship.

Q: Leaving China to face Japan and Russia.

GREEN: They [the Chinese] didn't like that. On the other hand they suspected that all this US-Japan partnership talk might have a contrary design. Maybe the United States was building up Japan as a military force before it left the area, so that Japan could take over China.

When I was in Peking [with President Nixon], I had a number of talks with a man who was very close to the Chinese Prime Minister Zhou En-lai. His name was Hsiung Hsiung-hui, a special assistant to the prime minister. On three occasions during the visit he took me aside—during automobile rides and once when we were rowing on the lake at Hangzhou—to talk about Japan. It was clear that he and the prime minister were deeply concerned about Japan. They feared that we were playing our hand in such a way that Japan was going to be a new military power on the world scene. China's memories of Japanese occupation were very deep and rather fresh. I said, and it turned out that Henry Kissinger had said the same thing when he was in Peking in the summer of 1971, that, on the contrary, our whole purpose in our relationship with Japan was to ensure that Japan did

not have to be rearmed, except for self defense. We would provide the “Sunday punch,” and Japan would not “go nuclear.” Japan would not have any expansionist capabilities, because of our treaty alliance. The Chinese had never thought of it that way. I added that the more lasting our security relationship with Japan is, the greater the chances were that Japan would never be, or pose anything like, a military threat to China. Anyway, I think that that went over well.

We must remember here that Japan and China have a long, long stormy relationship, particularly during the years preceding and during World War II. Therefore, there are very deep-seated Chinese fears of Japan. I don't think that the White House ever took them adequately into consideration. This Chinese fear of Japan was more in the calculations of the State Department.

The person on the State Department side who was the most knowledgeable on Japan was U. Alexis Johnson, the Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs. Johnson's book, “The Right Hand of Power,” devotes a good deal of attention to this particular issue at this particular moment. He graphically described the concerns which our China policy had created in Japan. He reproved the President rather strongly about our failure to consult with the Japanese properly, such as by sending Alex to Japan, maybe a day or so in advance of the announcement. This would have had the effect of giving Prime Minister Sato time to prepare his position publicly and how he was going to express it. Secondly, for us to have taken the unusual step of sending a special emissary to Japan, would be evidence of the primacy we accorded Japan and the importance we attached to Japan's constructive relationship with China. However, for reasons which have never been explained, the administration called off plans to have Johnson make that trip which left a permanent scar on US-Japan relations, according to Alex.

In my meetings with Japanese Prime Minister Sato and Foreign Minister Fukuda following Nixon's China trip, they acted like the old friends that they are. Even though the press, including especially the press in the United States, was talking about what a disaster

this had been for US-Japanese relations, that was not my impression at all. I read Selig Harrison's and other people's accounts of the mood in Japan at the time I arrived. By the time I left I had the impression that this view was far too pessimistic. The fact of the matter is that I got along fine with both the prime minister and the foreign minister. The Embassy in Tokyo later reported that what a success our visit had been in terms of allaying Japanese concerns over our China policy. So I think that we got over that hump. That doesn't mean that there are no residual fears.

I might add one other thing here, and I'll come back to this later. I mentioned the Nixon “shocks.” We had other problems with the Japanese, largely over trade.

At the time of the agreement with Japan on the reversion of the Ryukyu Islands in November, 1969, there was an understanding that one of the things that Japan would do, in response to our rather generous offer on the return of the Ryukyus, was that they would respect certain “restraints” on textile [exports to the United States]. President Nixon was under very heavy pressure from a number of members of Congress from the South, where our textile industry had moved, to “deliver” on these restraints, so that the Japanese would not export such large quantities of textiles.

Well, to make a long story short, from his end Prime Minister Sato was unable to bring “his” textile industry along. Therefore, that understanding fell apart. President Nixon was furious. This was another area where I don't think that the President ever understood the Japanese leadership, as he did the Chinese leadership. I'm sure that he compared Sato, Fukuda, and others rather unfavorably with men like Zhou En-lai, who had a great, broad political and strategic vision of the world. The Japanese leadership seemed to be narrowly focused on economic issues, and the President and Henry Kissinger were not very strong in that area. That was another reason why they were rather prejudiced against Japan.

There has always been a tendency in our Foreign Service, as, in fact, in the US Government, which goes way back, for at least 100 years, for officials to be either pro-

Chinese or pro-Japanese. It seemed that we had fallen again into that syndrome, with the President favoring China over Japan. He would never say so, but that would seem to have been the case. It came largely down to personalities and the fact that, as interpreters, the Chinese used attractive young ladies, who would laugh uproariously when the President made a joke, before they even brought themselves to interpret it, which was a clear signal to the audience that they had damned well better laugh. The Japanese interpreters did their work in a solemn, matter of fact voice. Interpreting Chinese is much easier than interpreting Japanese—that is simultaneous interpreting. The word order in Chinese sentences is similar to the word order in English, whereas Japanese word order is more like German—very difficult. These are the kinds of things that have added to problems in US-Japanese relations.

Q: How did you rate our Embassy in Japan during the 1969-1973 period? This was a major period.

GREEN: We had very good people in Japan, although Ambassador Armin Meyer was not a Japanese expert. He had come from being Ambassador to Iran. As a matter of fact, I had been offered the job and given the choice. To make a long story short, I decided to be Assistant Secretary instead. Armin had some very good Japanese specialists on his staff, including Dick Sneider. So I would say that it was a strong Embassy.

Q: So you felt that the reporting...

GREEN: The reporting was excellent.

Q: We were speaking of Henry Kissinger and Japan. This reminds me of his book, "The White House Years." He talked about going to Rome. When I read the book, I had the feeling that, in Kissinger's view, the Italian Government was really just a coalition—sort of the same coalition, with people "trading" government portfolios. So you couldn't get anything done. Kissinger—and, I guess, President Nixon, too—were people who wanted to sit down with somebody and make a deal. You can't make a deal with a coalition

government because there are too many people involved, who tend to "water down" things. It sounds as if there was a similar process going on with the Japanese. It's well known that In Japan you don't talk to somebody in the Japanese Government and really reach an agreement. It takes extended negotiations with both the government and within the bureaucracy to reach a consensus.

GREEN: Absolutely. The bureaucracy in Japan is all-important. Where we have political figures at the top, they have experts and bureaucrats—and these include bureaucrats who specialize in foreign affairs and are very knowledgeable.

To be a leader, people have to know where you're going. When a US leader suddenly and independently changes his course and direction—or seems to do so—it causes a great deal of concern. It was our task to allay that concern. My wife's remark about how wise it was for the President to send two Foreign Service Officers to explain the Nixon visit to China to Far East leaders was entirely valid, since John and I, were known to leaders in Asia. They knew we didn't just come in with one administration and then left. We didn't have any political axes to grind. We were not trying to make a career out of this matter. We were trying to do what was best for the United States and for friendly countries concerned.

Q: When William Rogers was Secretary of State during this period, did he have much "feel" for Japan?

GREEN: I think that Bill Rogers had a good feeling for public opinion. He would have been a first rate Minister of Information, which many countries have. Of course, his activities were so sharply curtailed and circumscribed by Nixon and Kissinger that it's not fair to judge the man. I knew Bill Rogers very well. We were very good friends and played a lot of bridge and golf together, quite apart from our office contacts. I trusted him. I think that he liked the Foreign Service. I felt that he could have done more in the way of taking up with the President the fact that the Foreign Service strongly supported his policies. I remember that I had an impassioned discussion with Rogers about this at the President's poolside in

San Clemente, CA. I couldn't get Bill Rogers to say more than that he would take this up at the right time. I don't think that he ever did.

In particular, as I pointed out in War and Peace with China, the President made a serious mistake not only in his unwarranted distrust of the Foreign Service but also in his refusal to take Alex Johnson and me into his total confidence. As a result he ran some serious risks which are mentioned in my book and one of those included his unnecessarily sharp affrontal of the Japanese Government. Subsequently Nixon was able to allay Japanese resentment when the President and Mrs. Nixon, at my suggestion, journeyed all the way up to Alaska to greet their Imperial Majesties en route to Europe by polar flight. This was the first trip outside Japan by any reigning monarch of Japan; and the first foreign soil he was to step on was US soil.

Q: One of the rationales given out, and I tend to be very dubious about rationales, which are usually developed on an "ex post facto" basis, is that the White House was concerned that, if it consulted Japan on any subject, the country "leaked" like mad. So the White House felt that it had to be very careful. Half the reason for Nixon's problems was always...

GREEN: Nixon always put it in the sense that it would be a great blow to China if the news of his trip to China should leak out. He acted as though secrecy was something enjoined by China. That's not the case at all. It was his own desire for secrecy that was the controlling consideration here. However, he carried this penchant for secrecy to ridiculous lengths. The arrangements for the President's trip to China by Kissinger had to be secret. I fully agree with that. That they didn't inform the Japanese, say, a week or two weeks in advance, was understandable and justifiable. It is true that the Japanese Government party, the Liberal-Democratic Party, is a coalition of factions whose leaders usually have to be consulted before the Prime Minister takes any action. So the Prime Minister would probably have been under some obligation to "check in" with the LDP factional leaders if there had been, say, more than a day or two advance notice. Had we done that, probably the whole matter of the President's visit to China would have leaked to the press. So, as I

say, it's a question of degree. I think that sending Alex Johnson to talk with Prime Minister Sato 24 hours in advance would have been very helpful on that issue.

Q: Shall we talk about the reversion of Okinawa [the Ryukyu Islands]? I always felt that this was one of the most difficult things to handle, internally within the US Government. The US Department of Defense was almost adamant about not giving Okinawa up, at least from some points of view.

GREEN: The Department of Defense was a bit “sticky” on this issue—more than it was on the US-Japan Security Treaty of 1960. Incidentally, the Security Treaty of 1960 came up for renewal in 1970. So the questions that came up in 1969 regarding the reversion of the Ryukyus also had to take into consideration the fact that, if the reversion negotiations fell through, the Security Treaty with Japan might not be renewed by the Japanese. Meanwhile, there was a great deal of Japanese pressure on us to “do something” about the Ryukyus.

Now the issue of the reversion of the Ryukyus was very complex. First of all, their strategic importance has to be underlined strongly. These are a chain of islands, Okinawa being the most important one. It is located off the East China Sea, right in the middle of this whole series of islands looping down from southern Japan. It couldn't be more critically located. More than that, Okinawa is a large island, large enough to accommodate Japanese farmers and city residents, as well as a lot of American installations. We had a problem with the administration there. It wasn't just like a big US military base. There was a large Okinawan population to deal with. Increasingly, there was a great deal of sentiment, mostly among the Okinawans, regarding their future reversion status. Going back to the Peace Treaty with Japan of 1951, the Ryukyus had been placed temporarily under American administration. However, their ultimate sovereignty was vested in Japan. So it was simply a question of when the Ryukyus were going to revert to Japanese control.

In the State Department we thought—and certainly the Embassy in Tokyo did too—that it was critically important to move rapidly on the Ryukyus. Things were beginning to go “sour” in both the Ryukyus and Japan. We needed to move in a timely fashion, bearing in mind that we had a deadline of 1970 [for the renewal of the Security Treaty of 1960]. So we entered into talks about the reversion of the Ryukyus with the Japanese in Tokyo and Washington.

The big question was this. We had major bases in the Ryukyus that were of critical importance in the support of any operation that we might have to conduct in Southeast Asia—or China or Korea, for that matter in support of our commitment. If the Ryukyus reverted to Japan, we would have to have bases in the Ryukyus on a continuing basis. We would also have to have ready access to those bases and the ability to use them when critically necessary. Our allies and friends in embattled Southeast Asia, Korea and Taiwan were concerned over their dependence on our basis in Japan, for Japan always had a tendency of being rather pacifistic, and might deny us the use of those bases at a critical moment. So we had to meet that concern in any communiqu# with Japan on reversion.

We finally got Japan to agree on language in the Joint Communiqu# (on the reversion of the Ryukyus to Japan) which stated that Korea was vital to the security of Japan and the United States; and that the security of Taiwan was more important. Once we got agreement on that language, then things began to fall pretty much into place. So we and the Japanese were able to declare in November [1969], that the Ryukyus would revert to Japan in 1972. We needed the time between 1969 and 1972 to complete an enormous amount of housekeeping and bookkeeping duties so as to turn the administration over to Japan.

As you know, the drafting of most communiqu#s always precedes agreements and visits. They are not done afterwards. The communiqu# had been agreed to long before Prime Minister Sato came to Washington. When Sato come to Washington, there was a press conference, at which he made a statement which, in essence, said that Japan recognized

the critical importance of the Ryukyus to the United States in discharging its security missions. Of course, it is a basic principle of our Navy and of our military never to confirm or deny the presence of any particular weapons systems such as nuclear. So we couldn't confirm or deny this. Instead, there was an acceptable Japanese-US “understanding,” that the issue had been worked out in satisfactory fashion for the Japanese.

The Ryukyu issue has been discussed at some length in “The Right Hand of Power,” by U. Alexis Johnson. I really don't have much to add to that. You will recall that he pointed out [in the book] that there was a long, sad story of Japanese inattention to the Ryukyus. There were a lot of bitter feelings in the Ryukyus about the Japanese at that time—bitter feelings that Japan has subsequently been at pains to allay.

Q: Protesting about things that happened before World War II.

GREEN: Yes. The people of the Ryukyus felt like “second class citizens” and all of that. So that was another issue which had to be straightened out. In other words, there had to be assurances by the Japanese that they were going to treat the Ryukyus “the right way.” Of course, the Japanese had a reason for giving such assurances, because the international spotlight was right on them. I never had any doubt that the Japanese would treat the Ryukyus properly.

We had to have extended talks and discussions in Tokyo and Washington over the actual reversion of the Ryukyus. The financial arrangements were “sticky,” because the United States felt that we were giving up an awful lot of property and we already had constructed many buildings, roads, utilities, etc. The Japanese finally did come through fairly handsomely on payments to the United States for materiel, buildings, and so forth which we had left to the people of the Ryukyus.

It was a complex negotiation, involving just about every department of our government. I was the chairman of the task force in our government, dealing with all of these financial and other issues.

Q: Could you discuss your experience in dealing with the US Department of Defense, at your level, on the issue of reversion of the Ryukyus?

GREEN: Yes, I can. I think that I may have mentioned to you, on previous occasions, Stu, that I consider that the Department of Defense has come a long way over the past 10 years or so, in terms of understanding diplomatic and strategic issues. There isn't the kind of “gulf” separating military from State Department thinking which may have existed at one time. When you were dealing with Generals like Curtis Lemay, of course it was difficult. His solutions started with 15 kiloton nuclear bombs and went up from there. State Department solutions involve no kilotons, if we can help it. Furthermore, we have tried to think in long range, political terms. I think that once we got that point through to the military, they understood it very well and were strong supporters of this approach. As I said, I thought that Admiral Arleigh Burke and various CINCPACs were superb as “sailor statesmen.” They talked the same language that we did. Setting up all these political advisers throughout the world also helped. Then there are the war colleges, which have helped. The United States, I think, has done more than any other country—possibly Britain has done as much, I don't know, but certainly the US has done more than the countries that I have dealt with—to try to instill a common understanding by civil and military leaders of national goals and purposes and how to achieve them.

We have had problems. When it comes down to dollars and cents and particular issues, yes, there have been lots and lots of problems which we have had to iron out. However, regarding major issues, as you “kick them upstairs,” you begin to find more and more opportunities to resolve them.

Q: Is there any other area that we should cover on Japan before we move to Australia?

GREEN: Yes, there is one other area that I would like to mention. I think that I began to mention it during the last session that we had, Stu. That is, relations between the ROK and Japan.

Q: The ROK means the Republic of Korea.

GREEN: The Republic of Korea and Japan. Of course, this now looms rather significantly in terms of North Korea developing nuclear weapons and what concerns this can create in Japan. Clearly, one of the advantages that Japan saw in our security relationship was the fact that we had a military presence in South Korea. In other words, we had American troops standing between Japan and its potential enemies—North Korea, communist China, the Soviet Union. Throughout my years as Assistant Secretary and as Deputy Assistant Secretary and Regional Planning Adviser before that, I and others in State and Defense had worked very hard for the retention of American forces in Korea. We still have them there today. The reason we have them there today has as much to do with Japan as with South Korea. If we didn't have those forces there, the Japanese would be far more concerned and worried about whether they were putting their necks out too far by being allied with the United States.

There has also been the long-standing problem of feuding in Japan among the 750,000 Koreans residing there, with sharp lines drawn between those supporting North Korea and those supporting South Korea. Obviously the pro-North Korean crowd gave Japan the most concern because of their links with the communists in Asia as well as with disappointed youth in Japan. And of course, all Koreans whether in Japan or Korea harbored long memories of harsh Japanese rule in Korea earlier in the century.

US policy in this situation has been to urge the fair treatment of all Koreans in Japan and the development of much closer relations between Japan and South Korea.

In 1972 we heard the news that the North Koreans had made an overture to the South Koreans, suggesting talks leading to the reunification of Korea. Obviously, this idea was one which we welcomed, although we greatly distrusted North Korea's motives. Sure enough, the North Koreans were making a “grandstand play.” They wanted to go for some kind of political union [between the two Korea's], or something like that. They were asking for those things which they knew the South couldn't give. They also knew that the South had a lot of students who, for a long time, have been very anxious to have relations with North Korea. There were a lot of people in South Korea who wanted to visit their friends and relatives in North Korea.

The positions of South Korea, the United States, and Japan had always been, “Let's work toward eventual reunification. Let's have more exchanges. Let's develop a degree of mutual trust that will then enable us to move into the political realm.” The very fact that the North Koreans wanted to move immediately into the political realm indicated quite clearly that they were trying to upset South Korea. What we knew—although we didn't say this—was that the North Koreans were basically trying to get the South Koreans to agree to reunification under terms which provided that the United States would withdraw its forces from South Korea. We knew that this would be anathema to the Japanese, as well as to ourselves and to the South Koreans. And maybe even to the Chinese, by the way.

So we had to play this game very delicately. In 1972 I made a trip to South Korea. I had talks with President Park Chung Hee, as well as with Kim Chong Pil, the Prime Minister, Kim Yong Shik, the Foreign Minister, and Lee Hu Rak, the head of their CIA who was in contact with North Korea about these matters. We went into some detail about them. I found that the South Koreans' thinking was about the same as ours. When I went to Japan I reassured the Japanese about the talks I had had in South Korea. So I was able to help calm down what could have been a rather dangerous situation—at least, politically dangerous.

I mention that because, as it turned out, Japan and South Korea did develop good trading relationships. In essence, what happened was that Japan's success in moving away from labor intensive industries into the high tech field meant that Japan's labor intensive industrial field was left for other Asians to occupy. The South Koreans then moved into shipbuilding and textiles. Eventually, they moved out of that, and those activities shifted on to other countries, such as Indonesia, for example. This was the beginning of a train of events where the Japanese were able to help the South Koreans, and the South Koreans, in turn, were able to help other countries. This was all part of the regional interdependence that we were hoping to encourage.

There is one other major development in 1972 relating to Japan. That is, that Japan normalized its relations with China in September, 1972. Preceding that in June we had a meeting with the Japanese in Hawaii. President Nixon, Kissinger, Secretary of State Rogers, Alex Johnson, and I flew out in the President's plane to the Kuilima Hotel, which is on the other side of Oahu from Waikiki Beach. There we had a two-day conference with the Japanese, led by the new Japanese Prime Minister Tanaka.

I remember that on the plane going out to Honolulu, Alex Johnson, Rogers, Kissinger, and I were quite concerned that, since it was known that Japanese Prime Minister Tanaka was going to go to Peking to normalize relations, the Japanese were in a rather weak bargaining position. Tanaka had to deliver on his promise to the Japanese people that he would normalize relations with China during his trip to Peking in September, 1972. This was a situation the Chinese could exploit. We knew little about Tanaka. He hadn't had any advanced education and was a newcomer in the international field. We were rather concerned that China would come up with terms and demands which were going to make it very difficult for Taiwan and the United States. It could be rather shattering for our relationship with Japan if Japan were to accede to such demands.

These matters were discussed on the plane going out to Hawaii. It was really quite interesting, because I remember that President Nixon seemed less concerned about

Tanaka's trip to China than did the rest of us. He was right. Those were not problems, as it turned out.

When Prime Minister Tanaka went to Peking a couple of months later to normalize relations, the Chinese were very considerate and reasonable. No demands were made of the Japanese to terminate any of their commercial and cultural ties with Taiwan, for example, with respect to airlines, sea routes, telecommunications of any kind, or cultural contacts. All that China demanded was that there should be a Japanese Embassy in Peking and not in Taipei. So the Japanese actually did get to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China before we did. During the normalization process Peking made it very clear that it welcomed good relations with Japan, good relations with the United States, and good relations between the United States and Japan. Here we had three countries, all of whom had been at war with each other at some point during the previous half century now at peace, representing the world's most powerful country (the US), the world's most populous country (China) and the world's most economically dynamic nation (Japan).

Q: You mentioned that you were the "regional man" in the State Department. You were looking for good relations between the various countries. Now I'm looking at this matter almost from the Foreign Service point of view. At Chiefs of Mission meetings, did you find the usual parochialism, localitis, or what have you from the various ambassadors or their deputies? Did you have to urge them to play a more cooperative role?

GREEN: No. The only flare up I recall between two of our members where parochialism was involved, occurred at our Chiefs of Mission meeting near Manila in 1971. I have already given you an account of this memorable exchange between our Ambassadors to Korea (Bill Porter) and to Japan (Armin Meyer).

Our Ambassadors are our officials generally, whether in Washington or the field, reflected an awareness of US overall interests and were not given to parochialism, for it was and

is basic to US policy that our friends and allies harmonize their relationships as far as possible. Much of our efforts have been directed towards furthering that goal.

Here I should add that our Chiefs of Mission conferences, usually annual affairs in pleasant places like Baguio (the Philippines), Hong Kong or Tokyo, were also attended by representatives of the Defense Department (CINCPAC), AID (Agency for International Development), USIS and a few other agencies.

Q: Before we leave the subject of Japan, I wonder if you could comment on how you felt that Japan operated in the rest of the world. It has become a very important country economically. The Japanese don't seem to have the "clout" or influence that the United States has. In a way, it doesn't seem that Japan will move in that direction outside of the field of economics. Do you have any views on that?

GREEN: As far as military affairs are concerned, Japan is bound by its constitution. More than that, it is bound by its own fears of involvement in a war. The effects of World War II were traumatic, as far as the Japanese were concerned. In my opinion, the chances of their going "militaristic" are very low, indeed. They are all the more reliant on the United States, because their whole position in the world is based upon commerce—access to raw materials and markets. The United States is the best guarantor of that—far better than the United Nations itself. And the Japanese know that. It is a fundamental "plus" in our relationship as long as we are a reliable ally, standing firm against threats to Japan and the US, such as are now implicit in the potential development of nuclear war capabilities by North Korea.

Now I will not get into US-Japan trade issues, but it must be emphasized that in the realms of trade, economics, technology and science, the Japanese are fully as powerful as the US. Its role in third world development assistance is highly laudable.

Where Japan is weak and, in terms of its size and power, too ineffectual on the world scene relative to its failure to be adequately involved in global strategies, political and social issues.

Finally, let me emphasize the supervening importance of the US-Japanese relationship in the years ahead—and the consequent need for greater American understanding of the Japanese people and their culture.

In our relations with Japan, we have discovered that it is very hard for the Japanese to make up their minds, very hard for them to reach a consensus. They are consensus builders. We're not. We can have Republicans come to town and, overnight, we have new US programs and policies. It's all too fast. But in Japan such things take a long, long time. So that if we're looking for quick answers and quick results, as we often do as a world leader—we try to “sign people up”—we find the Japanese lagging behind. Because of their political processes, they operate that way. Almost all democratic countries do that—much more than we do. So it takes some time for Japan to make up its mind. And sometimes we get impatient. That's one difficulty.

Another difficulty, of course, is in the whole field of trade and the way their system works. The Japanese are far better organized than we are. They save a great deal more than we do. A lot of the things that we do badly, they do well, and vice versa. I've often thought that the best solution for Japan and the United States is for each to be more like the other. Americans could save more and plan further ahead, the way the Japanese do, to place greater emphasis on education and family unity, more circumspect, more cautious, and certainly to think more in terms of the interests of society, rather than just those of the individual. We would do better if we did that.

For their part the Japanese would do better if they thought more in terms of other races, the need to harmonize with other peoples of different backgrounds, to relax and enjoy life more, spending more on housing, infrastructure and the good things in life. Also if they

strove to play a more constructive role across a wider range of the world agenda. These are the things that the Japanese should do.

I believe the Japanese have always rather envied the United States for its wide open spaces and its free spirit. We have to remember that Japan has always lived on a few, rocky islands off the shores of Asia—far away from the rest of the world with which it has commercial links. Its whole history, its topography, its geography, its outlook are different. So we are “the odd couple” which simply has to get along.

The most important long-term investment we can make toward improving US-Japanese understanding is for Americans to know a lot more about the Japanese, their language and culture than we do today.

I accordingly inaugurated in 1988, with the help of my wife, the Marshall Green Fund, managed by the Japan-American Society of Washington, DC of which I was President at that time. This Fund supports programs encouraging the study of Japanese language and of Japanese area studies deeply at the high school level. Originally the program operated only in the Washington area; now it is nationwide, providing incentive awards to students and teachers as well as videotapes, Japanese encyclopedias and dictionaries. The Fund also finances with the help of Mobil Corp. an annual “Japan Bowl” competition among high schools in terms of language proficiency and general knowledge about Japanese policies, history and culture. Nineteen teams competed in the Japan Bowl” in 1995 held at the George Mason University.

Q: Well, shall we turn to Australia for a bit?

GREEN: I wasn't prepared to talk about Australia, but I will.

Q: You were in Australia [as Ambassador] from when to when?

GREEN: I was there from 1973 to 1975—the middle of 1973 to the middle of 1975. About two years there.

Q: Could you explain how you got that assignment?

GREEN: It was one of those assignments—and about the only one that I got—which I worked out for myself. I was Assistant Secretary for East Asia and Pacific Affairs at the time and was more or less in a position to get the next job that I wanted. There were two countries that were “open” in our area for Ambassadors; the Philippines or Australia. Bill Sullivan, my deputy, had been head of the Vietnam task force, and was very close to Henry Kissinger. He had traveled with him, particularly during those frenetic moments before the Paris Peace Conference, in January, 1973. So Bill Sullivan enjoyed great “clout” over at the White House. He could get pretty much what he wanted.

Since I was his superior, and since both of us were looking for new jobs well removed from the war in Indochina, I said, “Bill, you see a lot of Henry Kissinger on your trips down there [to Key Biscayne, Florida, to meet with President Nixon]. You and I have been in this job for four years now, and it's time we got out. I know there are two key jobs now about to open in the bureau, Australia and the Philippines. I also know that you want Australia. Well, so do I and I'm older and I'm your senior. So please feel free to accept the Philippines.” So on one of his trips down to Florida, they really settled this matter. Of course, they had to talk to the President. I think that the President was only too glad to have me go to Australia.

Now, the reason why he was glad to have me go to Australia was not so much that Australia was a wonderful place. I've liked the Australians and always have. It had nothing to do with that. It had to do with the fact that our relations with Australia suddenly had plummeted when the Australian Labor Party [the ALP] came into power after being in the opposition for about 23 years. During all of those years, when the ALP was out of power and when the Liberal Party, in coalition with the Country Party—more or less the

"conservatives"—ran the government, the Liberal-Country government campaigned on the basis of its close ties with the United States. In other words, they claimed, "We are the parties that have the friendship of the United States." One of the campaign slogans of the Liberal-Country coalition had been, "All the way with LBJ"—that is, with President Johnson. LBJ loved Australia. He always thought that Australia was the next, rectangular state West of El Paso and treated it that way.

In late 1972 there was a change in the government, and Labor came to power for the first time in more than 20 years. Labor was influential in getting Australia out of the war in Vietnam, which, I think, President Nixon took amiss. The idea that our great, staunch ally suddenly had "opted out" of the war, largely due to the influence of the Labor Party, which was now the governing party, [was less than agreeable to the President]. When the Labor Party came to power, some of its ministers began to make some very nasty statements about American foreign policy, Vietnam, and all the rest of it. There were the same anti-Vietnam feelings in Australia that we had in our country.

Q: Wasn't there a relationship between their Labor Party and the left wing of the Labour Party in Great Britain? They had some of the same "class attitudes" and so forth.

GREEN: There was a "left" and a "right" in the Australian Labor Party. There were some left wingers, but there were also people whose views were politically almost the same as those of the outgoing, Liberal Party.

What we didn't know in Washington was that some of the statements that were being made by Labor cabinet ministers, which were outrageous, were not officially endorsed by the government as such. Cabinet ministers of the Australian Labor Party—this was not true of cabinet ministers of the Liberal and Country Parties—were considered to be speaking officially only when discussing matters within their own portfolios. So the statements by ministers like Cairns, Connor and Cameron criticizing the US, Nixon and our policies in Vietnam were "non-official" and not to be taken seriously by the US. But we took

it as an official expression of what the government felt. I should have known better, but we in Washington were uninformed on that point since it had never come up before, Labor being out of power for so long.

The White House was absolutely incensed. Nixon then left instructions that nobody at the rank of Assistant Secretary or above could speak to any Australian officials in Washington or elsewhere. This made it very difficult for me because one of my closest friends was Jim Plimsoll, who was the Australian Ambassador to Washington and later was the Australian Ambassador to Moscow. He was also a real authority on the United Nations. We consulted with him quite a bit on the “Chirep” issue, as we called the Chinese representation question. He was enormously helpful. The idea of cutting off communications was foolish. I went to Secretary of State Rogers and said, “Mr. Secretary, I cannot do this.” He said, “Well, you do just what you think you have to do. I don't think there will be any problems.” So I had meetings with Jim at his house, where we talked over things. I kept him apprized, and so forth.

Q: Did you let him know about this unhappiness [in the White House]?

GREEN: Yes, of course. He knew all about it. By the way, Ambassador Plimsoll told me that in Australia they also had problems around the beginning of the year. That's their summer. He said, “That's our silly season. People make all kinds of asinine remarks.” He said, “Your silly season is the reverse of ours,” occurring during August when everyone's off on vacation, physically and mentally.

True enough. The beginning of the year is the serious season in Washington. There is the State of the Union speech, the economic message of the President, and all that. Here were Australian cabinet ministers coming in with irresponsible remarks. Nixon was absolutely furious.

Anyhow, Nixon called me up and asked me to be Ambassador to Australia. He said, “Normally, Marshall, I wouldn't send you to a place like Australia, but right now it is critically

important. I think that you're the man for it." I said, "Thank you, Mr. President. I will do my very best. I really welcome this assignment." So I got it despite all of the nasty things Nixon had said behind my back—and he "fired" me a couple of times. Basically we always maintained a friendship that lasted right through to his death. When I was about to go to Australia, I happened to be walking with the President from a White House luncheon toward his oval office. President Nixon suddenly expostulated: "Marshall, I can't stand that...." And he used some expletives to describe Prime Minister Whitlam, which was a strange kind of parting instruction to get from your President.

So I arrived in Australia against this background. Meanwhile, the Australian trade unions had declared a boycott on handling any American vessels coming to Australia. Acting on his own Teddy Gleason slapped a counter-boycott against loading or unloading any Australian vessels in American east coast ports.

Q: Ted Gleason is the president of the International Longshoremen's Union in the United States.

GREEN: Yes, on the East coast. Since Australian exports to the United States were mostly perishable cargo—we are talking about meat, dairy products, and things like that—non-servicing Australian vessels was a far more serious situation. Anyway, that eventually brought the Australians back to their senses.

So, when I arrived in Australia, it was against all of this background. But the very fact that I had been an Assistant Secretary of State and a career man, going to Australia, was regarded by Prime Minister Whitlam as such a feather in his cap that he played it for all it was worth. There were statements that came out in the press that at last America realized that Australia was important and that, at last, Australia has a career man as American Ambassador. I was the first career man assigned as Ambassador to Australia in a long, long time.

Q: Also, you were a career man coming from the top position in the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

GREEN: So Whitlam played this up for all it was worth. The first press conference I had was a very difficult one because the issue [of Whitlam's proposed visit to the US] had risen in the press. Prime Minister Whitlam was going to go to England to a meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers by way of Washington. He wanted to pay a call on the President. So I relayed his wishes to Washington and got an answer, “Hell, no.” I sent a telegram back and said that the refusal of the President to receive Prime Minister Whitlam would be a very serious blow to Australia-American relations.

Meanwhile, I got in touch with opposition leaders, who had been good friends of the United States for all of these years. I asked them for their views on the matter of Whitlam's reception in Washington. Some of them communicated their views without my asking for them. I know that Billy Snedden [Liberal Party leader] and other opposition leaders at that time came in loud and strong that if President Nixon refused to meet the Prime Minister of Australia, that would be considered such an insult to all Australians that they —the conservatives—would suffer more than the Australian Labor Party because the conservatives were known to be our friends. I got that message to Washington, resulting in a decision that Whitlam be received.

Whitlam did go to Washington. I went back to the US with him. I saw Henry Kissinger beforehand. We talked about some of the practical issues that had come up. I said that I hoped that the President would be his usual, gracious self. Kissinger said, “Don't worry, the President will handle it just fine.” So Whitlam had a good meeting with President Nixon. There were a lot of trade issues that we had to discuss. At the end of the meeting I accompanied Whitlam and Nixon down to the South Portico of the White House and saw him off in his car. As we were standing there, waving Whitlam off, Nixon turned to me and

said, “You know, he's quite a guy,” which is as close as the President came to paying him a compliment. So that bad beginning happened to have a good end.

During my time in Australia I guess that my principal task was one of trying to redefine our relationship, which had been too much a dominant US relationship, with the United States telling Australia what to do. The whole question of consultation was involved. And by consultation I did not mean merely advance notice but really consulting. This became a really important issue. We failed on occasion to do it, and it caused a real blowup in Australia. For example, we announced our intention to develop a submarine base in the middle of the Indian Ocean and didn't give Australia advance notice. This is the kind of thing they flared up about.

Q: You're referring to the defense facility at Diego Garcia.

GREEN: Yes. By the way, there was an interesting story about Diego Garcia. We got a circular telegram to all of our posts in the Indian Ocean littoral, asking them to report on how the respective host governments felt about our base at Diego Garcia. I saw Prime Minister Whitlam on frequent occasions. He was a very close friend. He told me how Australia felt about it, and his reaction was generally upbeat; and we got copies of telegrams to Washington from Ambassador Moynihan in India, and from other American Embassies. There was a one-line telegram from Dave Osborn, who was our Ambassador to Burma. He said, “As far as the Burmese are concerned, Diego Garcia is just another damned Cuban cigar.” That was probably the most accurate of all of the mission reports to Washington.

Quite apart from the usual trade problems, we had some difficulties regarding our bases in Australia. We had these highly secret “facilities,” especially West of Alice Springs [Northern Territory] and Nurunga [South Australia], and also at Northwest Cape [West Australia], where we had a naval facility, basically a communications center for our submarines in that part of the world. It transmitted signals underwater for long distances

[Extremely Low Frequency—ELF—messages]. The use of our other bases and what our bases were doing were always difficult questions to handle, because we have not stated publicly, even to this day, the precise functions of the facilities we had at Alice Springs and Nurunga. That was one problem.

The other problem was that earlier we allowed American Congressmen to visit these bases but didn't let Australian Parliamentarians do so. By the time I arrived in Australia, Dick Sneider, who had meanwhile moved back to Washington to be Deputy Assistant Secretary, was enormously helpful to me. He had been my deputy in Washington. He helped to work out arrangements with the Australians regarding Congressional and Parliamentary visits. In other words, we allowed members of Parliament and of Congress to visit the facilities at Alice Springs and Nurunga. We didn't tell them all about it. They saw the facilities, but they didn't know everything about these highly classified bases.

The top leaders in Australia were privy to the mission of these facilities. Prime Minister Whitlam knew about them. However, I don't think that Whitlam ever fully understood, until near the end of my stay in Australia, why these facilities were so important for world peace. When he did understand this, he turned around from being more or less a “reluctant” ally to being an “enthusiastic” ally on this operation.

We worked these problems out. We had some difficulties because Whitlam's deputy [Jim Cairns] was one of the people who had been critical about our base facilities. The question arose of whether he would be informed. Normally, because of his job, he would be. However, it turned out that he didn't want to be informed. So that solved that problem.

We had a lot of issues that related to things of this nature. By and large, it was a question of redefining our relationship. I gave many speeches in Australia, all over the place. We had our own aircraft available which belonged to CINCPAC and was used by CINCPAC for ferrying personnel and members of our otherwise inaccessible bases in Central Australia and the Northwest Cape. But when the sizeable Convair Metropolitan was not

in use by CINCPAC, it was made available to me, and I used it often to get all around Australia as well as to make trips to remote areas in Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Nauru to which I was also accredited. The plane also enabled me to accept countless speaking engagements in many towns and cities of Australia. A typical such engagement involved arrival at noon for a city hall reception, followed by an afternoon of golf in which my plane pilot colonel and I challenged the local talent, followed by a gala dinner and speech and then spending the night at the home of an Australian friend in that area. Anyway, I gave many speeches—close to a hundred—and made many friends.

Q: It was good for your golf game, too.

GREEN: It did a lot for my golf game. The Australians love golf. They have 69 golf courses within 30 miles of the center of Canberra, to show you how culturally advanced they are. So I had a great time in Australia and I think that we successfully redefined our relationship.

As I had frequent occasion to say: the US and Australia, though enjoying many ties of friendship and common interests in world affairs, still retain their independent roles in the world. Neither of us should look for a locked-step relationship, for such a rigid relationship could only snap in the winds of controversy. Today our relationship must be both friendly and flexible, based on common values, and quite frequent consultations, and true equality.

May I just say one other thing about Australia, because it is something that most people probably don't realize. That is, the importance of the Battle of the Coral Sea. The Coral Sea victory...

Q: This was back in May, 1942.

GREEN: May, 1942. This was a critical moment in Australian history. You must remember that Australia has never been invaded and has never had a revolution or civil war. The only time that they nearly were attacked and occupied was when the Japanese

were poised to occupy Australia [in 1942], and the Battle of the Coral Sea turned this around. This had a tremendous impact on Australia. So they had a Coral Sea Week. When I was there, a well-known American like Defense Secretary Cap Weinberger and Mrs. Weinberger would come down and spend a week going around Australia. These sentimental contacts were all-important in our relationship, contributing to the depth and warmth. The fact that Australia hadn't had the revolutionary and civil war experiences which we have had as a nation left them a bit more vulnerable to tides of opinion.

I think that the American relationship was always very central in Australia, and that I left it that way. I might say, though, that the left wing of the Australian Labor Party did give me some problems. There was one man in particular, Senator William Brown, from the State of Victoria, who charged that I was the principal CIA agent in the Western Pacific and that I was in Australia to “undermine” the country, and so forth. These charges attracted a good deal of prominence. Prime Minister Whitlam, of course, rejected them. Then Senator Brown said that on July 4, [1974], he was going to say all that he knew about this. He had a big meeting in Melbourne, Victoria. Thousands of people jammed the streets. He climbed to the podium and then said nothing that he hadn't said before. People just turned away and said, “This guy is a crumb.” I was very high profile when I was in Australia and was very much at the center of press attention, because of the fact that we had sent...

Q: Because we had sent, not necessarily political “hacks,” but they had been friends of the President. Australia was regarded as a nice place to send “political people.”

GREEN: On one occasion I went back to the US on leave and found that the Australian Ambassador to the United States, whose name was Snow, had been in Washington for six months and hadn't called on Kissinger. I went to Henry and said, “You've got to receive the Australian Ambassador. After all, Prime Minister Whitlam receives me all the time.” Henry said, “Well, if you say so, Marshall, I will.” So I set up a meeting and was sitting in Kissinger's outer office with the Australian Ambassador, waiting to go in. Ambassador Snow said, “You know, I've been asked by my government to invite the President or Henry

Kissinger or both to visit our country. We've had no visits from the President for some time. We used to have them all the time. People are beginning to wonder. So if I invite the President or Henry Kissinger, what do you think his reply will be?" I said, "As far as Henry is concerned, he'll probably say that if he has any business in Antarctica, he'll be glad to stop off in Australia on his way down there or coming back." Well, damn it, that was exactly what Henry said when Ambassador Snow invited him to visit Australia. I told Henry this as the minister left the room. Henry then said to me, "Go down and turn that man off. He's going to report this." So I rushed down and caught Ambassador Snow's limousine by the handle, just as he was leaving. I said, "Look, Henry was just being amusing. Of course, he's honored to be invited," and so forth. But Henry never went to Australia.

Q: Well, shall we stop at this point? Do you think that you have left anything out?

GREEN: Okay.

Q: Unless there is something else. You can always add, you know, to your remarks.

GREEN: Well, there are so many things about Australia that I would like to say. Let's leave it at that. The main things I've said just now. My stay in Australia was a period of redefining our relationship.

End of interview